

# THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY



VOLUME XXII · JANUARY 1952 · NUMBER 1  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

# THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

A Journal of Investigation and Discussion in the Field of Library Science

Established by The Graduate Library School of The University of Chicago with the Co-operation of The American Library Association, The Bibliographical Society of America, and The American Library Institute.

## BOARD OF EDITORS

*Managing Editor*  
LEON CARNOVSKY

*Acting Managing Editor*  
LESTER E. ASHEIM

*Editorial Assistant*  
SIBYLLE O. CRANE

## *Associate Editors*

LESTER E. ASHEIM  
PIERCE BUTLER  
MARGARET E. EGAN

HERMAN H. FUSSLER  
FRANCES E. HENNE  
JESSE H. SHERA

## *Advisory Editors*

RALPH A. BEALS, Director, New York Public Library  
WM. W. BISHOP, Librarian Emeritus, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor  
LESLIE E. BLISS, Librarian, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino  
EDWARD J. CARTER, Head, Libraries Section, UNESCO  
F. C. FRANCIS, Keeper of Printed Books, British Museum, London  
CARLETON B. JOECKEL, Berkeley, California  
CARL H. MILAM, Barrington, Illinois  
RALPH MUNN, Director, Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh  
WILHELM MUNTZE, Director, University Library, Oslo  
CHARLES R. SANDERSON, Chief Librarian, Toronto  
EDWIN ELLIOTT WILLOUGHBY, Chief Bibliographer, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C.  
LOUIS R. WILSON, Dean Emeritus, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago

**The Library Quarterly** is published in January, April, July, and October by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois. Subscriptions are by volume only. The subscription price is \$6.00 per volume; the price of a single issue is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full volume will be charged at the single-issue rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions. No extra charge is made for countries in the Pan American Postal Union. Postage is charged extra as follows: for Canada and Newfoundland, 20 cents per volume (total \$6.20), 5 cents per issue (total \$1.80); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 50 cents per volume (total \$6.50), 10 cents per issue (total \$1.85). Subscriptions are payable in advance. Please make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

**The following** is an authorized agent for the British Empire, except North America and Australasia: The Cambridge University Press, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

**Claims for missing numbers** should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

**Business correspondence** should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

**Communications** for the editors, manuscripts, and books for review should be addressed to the Managing Editor, THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

**Applications for permission to quote** from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

**Microfilms** of complete volumes of this journal are available to regular subscribers only and may be obtained at the end of the volume year. Orders and inquiries should be addressed to University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

**Notice to subscribers:** If you change your address, please notify us and your local postmaster immediately.

Entered as second-class matter January 2, 1931, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 26, 1925, authorized January 9, 1931.

[PRINTED  
IN U.S.A.]

# THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. XXII

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1952

No. 1

INTER-UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION . . . . .	ERNEST C. COLWELL	1
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACE THE FUTURE . . . . .	KEYES D. METCALF	5
THE SCHOLAR LOOKS AT INTER-LIBRARY CO-OPERATION . . . . .	THEODORE C. BLEGEN	13
TASKS OF THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE . . . . .	RALPH E. ELLSWORTH	18
THE PIERPONT MORGAN LIBRARY . . . . .	GEORGE K. BOYCE	21
GRADUATE THESES ACCEPTED BY LIBRARY SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1950-51—SUPPLEMENT . . . . .		36
THE COVER DESIGN . . . . .	EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY	38
THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE . . . . .		39
REVIEW ARTICLE: THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS <i>SUBJECT CATALOG</i> : AN EVALUATION . . . . .	MAY G. HARDY	40
REVIEWS:		
Edward Heawood, <i>Watermarks Mainly of the 17th and 18th Centuries</i> . . . . .	A. T. HAZEN	51
Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt, in collaboration with Lawrence C. Wroth and Rollo G. Silver, <i>The Book in America: A History of the Making and Selling of Books in the United States</i> . . . . .	JAMES D. HART	53
Harry G. Aldis, <i>The Printed Book</i> . . . . .	FREDRIC J. MOSHER	55
Archer Taylor and Fredric J. Mosher, <i>The Bibliographical History of Anonyma and Pseudonyma</i> . . . . .	HENRY B. VAN HOESEN	56
Joachim Kirchner, <i>Germanistische Handschriftenpraxis: Ein Lehrbuch für die Studierenden der deutschen Philologie</i> . . . . .	CURT F. BÜHLER	57
Bernhard Lewin, <i>Den orientaliska boken: Skrift och Bokrösen i Islams värld</i> . . . . .		
Sir Francis Meynell, <i>Engelskt boktryck</i> . . . . .		
Carl Björkbom, <i>Gutenberg</i> . . . . .	LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON	58
S. R. Ranganathan, <i>Colon Classification</i> . . . . .	J. H. SHERA	59
Louis N. Ridenour, Ralph Shaw, and Albert G. Hill, <i>Bibliography in an Age of Science</i> . . . . .	VERNER W. CLAPP	61

[Contents continued on following page]

National Archives, <i>Federal Records of World War II</i> , Vols. I and II	WILLIAM J. VAN SCHREEVEN	63
James D. Stewart (ed.), <i>The Reference Librarian in University, Municipal and Specialised Libraries</i>	MARY N. BARTON	64
Mary Neill Barton (comp.), <i>Reference Books: A Brief Guide for Students and Other Users of the Library</i>	LOUIS SHORES	66
L. N. Malclès, <i>Les Sources du travail bibliographique</i> , Vol. I: <i>Bibliographies générales</i>	HENSLEY C. WOODBRIDGE	66
Lester J. Cappon and Stella F. Duff, <i>Virginia Gazette Index, 1736-1780</i> , Vols. I and II	ROBERT W. WADSWORTH	67
Hans Widmann, <i>Bibliographien zum deutschen Schrifttum der Jahre 1939-1950</i>	CARL W. HINTZ	68
<i>Deutsche Zeitschriften 1945-1949</i>	JOHANNES L. DEWTON	69
Javier Lasso de la Vega Jiménez-Placer and Francisco Cervera Jiménez-Alfaro (comps.), <i>Anuario español e hispanoamericano del libro y de las artes gráficas con el catálogo mundial del libro impreso en lengua española e índice general de los cuatro volúmenes publicados, 1947-1949</i>	LEWIS HANKE	70
<i>Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences</i>	H. A. INNIS	70
Samuel Spielvogel, <i>A Selected Bibliography on City and Regional Planning</i>	WALTER H. BLUCHER	71
"Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library: Personnel Administration"	EDWARD A. WIGHT	72
"Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library: Library Relationships in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area"		
"Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library: General Administration"		
"Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library: Recapitulation of Recommendations"	LEWIS F. STIEG	72
A. G. S. Enser, <i>Branch Library Practice</i>	LESTER ASHEIM	74
William S. Gray (ed.), <i>Keeping Reading Programs Abreast of the Times</i>	ALICE BROOKS MCGUIRE	75
Folke Dahl, Fanny Petibon, and Marguerite Boulet, <i>Les Débuts de la presse française: Nouveaux aperçus</i>	EUGENE B. BARNES	76
Letter to the Editor		77



# THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Volume XXII

JANUARY 1952

Number 1

## INTER-UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION<sup>1</sup>

ERNEST C. COLWELL

THE subject which I am to discuss with you is much broader than the subjects which have been given to the men who, out of their special competence, will discuss various particular aspects of the work of this institution in its relationship to libraries, scholarship, and institutions in the Middle West. My subject is the broadest possible one in this framework. Its breadth is doubtless a recognition of the fact that I spent a period of years as a university president and, in that period, lost the ability to speak with any particularity or definiteness. My subject is "Co-operation between Universities."

Co-operation between universities in the United States of America is increasing rapidly in extent. More than forty co-operative programs involving colleges and universities are now in operation in this country. Some of these involve no more than two institutions. One of them involves as many as forty institutions of higher education.

All these co-operative programs are, of course, partial. That is to say, no university co-operates with another univer-

sity in all its activities and functions. Those of you who know universities will recognize this as an impossibility, since, to the best of my knowledge, there are no two universities in America today which engage in exactly the same functions.

If the profile of one university is superimposed upon that of another, there will be large areas in which their silhouettes do not meet. All this co-operation, therefore, is really co-operation between parts of institutions or between institutions in regard to some particular function.

In some cases the co-operation is purely negative. For example, the university which employs me at the present time has a co-operative agreement with a neighboring institute of technology. The agreement is that Emory University will not teach any engineering; and, as a result of this agreement, it has eliminated the department of engineering. This is negative co-operation, in a sense. It is elimination of unnecessary duplicating activities and programs.

In some cases the co-operation involves no more than the exchange of some professors or the sharing of instruction in some classes. In others the

<sup>1</sup> A paper presented at the dedication ceremony of the Midwest Inter-Library Center on October 5, 1951.

co-operation is limited to the exchange of credits for work done. Others involve joint planning of the purchasing program for libraries. In one case, staff is exchanged for equipment. I am not sure which institution gains by that particular co-operative venture. There is very little duplication of pattern in these numerous instances of co-operation; and, as a result, there is a very wide variety in the areas of university life affected by the existing patterns of co-operation.

These co-operative programs vary also in the efficiency with which they work. It is my personal judgment that those that work best are of two sorts: they are either between universities, or parts of universities, of equal status and quality or, at the other extreme, between universities, or parts of universities, that differ widely in status or quality.

Where institutions share a common quality rating, their co-operation is faced with difficulties caused by suspicion and apprehension. This apprehension often has real justification, for, where the assumption of equality is made contrary to the fact, the institution of higher quality faces a real risk of deterioration through co-operation.

But, if an institution is admittedly weak in a particular subject in which another institution is admittedly strong, co-operation between them is feasible, and the balance can be achieved by reversing their roles in co-operation in another area. In short, it is my judgment that, where institutions are comparable in quality, co-operation is feasible. Where the disproportion in their quality is great, co-operation is feasible. But where the gradations in quality are small in extent but noticeable, co-operation is exceedingly difficult.

The majority of the co-operative programs that are in existence today arose from the desire for economy. The economies made possible by co-operation are real, they are numerous, and they are easily identified. But, excepting cases of an emergency nature, the wise educational leader will not appeal to the desire for economy as the basis for co-operation. If economy is the major motive, the supporters and rulers of education may discover that a reduction in the amount of education provides the greatest possible economy. This truism is seldom realized, I think, by the champions and proponents of co-operation; but, if the selling point is the number of thousands of dollars a year that can be saved and the selling is done to trustees or to legislatures, it may be that they will surmise that, if the entire operation were liquidated, the saving would be greater. The argument from economy should be used with the greatest prudence.

There are a few co-operating programs today which emphasize the resulting increase in educational resources for each participating institution. The building which we dedicate today houses a co-operative effort that deserves this relatively high classification. It produces economies, that is true; but its justification rests primarily in the fact that it increases the educational resources that are available to the member-institutions.

There is a third motive for inter-university co-operation, and this, I believe, is the future. The future in inter-university co-operation belongs to those who aim not alone at the increase of educational resources but also at the improvement of education, either in structure, in function, or in aim.

The obstacles to co-operation are not

material. The major obstacles are not wide separation in distance, lack of funds, and lack of facilities. The major obstacles are found in the mind and spirit of man. They are institutional pride and institutional jealousy, as they exist in the mind of a college president, that are the obstacles to co-operation. They are institutional pride and institutional jealousy, as they exist in the mind of a dean or a director or a faculty member, that block the development of effective programs of co-operation. They are inertia and complacency. It is self-satisfaction, institutionwise, that makes the building of effective co-operation a difficult thing.

And I would say, finally, that it is an irrational provincialism or an emotional particularism on the part of college faculties which makes co-operation difficult. Suppose, for example, that you were trying to persuade the faculty in a particular institution that there should be a limit to the areas within which it would buy books for its libraries. The faculty committee on the subject will agree to this, after a very brief discussion. A resolution, drafted undoubtedly by an open-minded librarian, will be adopted by the group with very little opposition. But the purchasing and ordering habits of professors will, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, be influenced by this not at all. Each professor will order every book that he thinks he might some day, or his successors might some day, find of some use or significance in their work. As professors, we are devoted to the advancement of the education, the improvement and the enrichment of the educational resources for our particular subject. This is our emotional loyalty and commitment—not to the general strategy of building up the library re-

sources of our institution as a whole. And this is an obstacle to effective co-operation in regard to library matters. It lies in attitudes in the minds of intelligent and good men.

Or, to take another instance of this irrational provincialism or emotional particularism, how many faculties today encourage the development of unneeded departments elsewhere? This I take as the classic instance of obstacles to effective inter-university co-operation.

If a particular faculty in some highly specialized area, such as Egyptology, is deeply devoted to this study of Egypt and a proposal is made that another university should establish a department of Egyptology, will the professors of Egyptology in institution No. 1 stop to consider whether one institution is enough for one country, as a center of research in Egyptology? Not for one moment. They will say, either explicitly, or silently to themselves: "Our subject will become more important if there are departments of our subject running and developing in institutions other than our own." They will encourage members of their own staff to lead, to establish such departments elsewhere; and they will thus encourage the waste of the educational resources of the country and make it difficult for universities to develop effective co-operation.

The obstacles to co-operation that I am trying to suggest are not stupid obstacles. They are not obstacles of matter or of dollars. They are obstacles in the minds and habits and attitudes of good men, and there is good in them.

It is for this reason that I suggest that the finest developments in this field will result when we appeal to university communities on the highest possible grounds for the establishment of effec-

tive co-operation; and, if we can demonstrate that a co-operative program will improve the quality of education in some area or some field or some school, then we have an argument that is weighty enough to overcome the partial good, the limited good, to which professors and administrative officers and presidents are devoted.

The co-operative programs which are based on the desire to improve education will overcome the obstacles to co-operation as no other type of appeal will. A famous money-raiser of the past generation said: "Never tell your prospective donor the low reasons for giving—he will think of them for himself."

Those interested in persuading universities to co-operate should never tell them the low reasons for co-operation.

The highest reasons alone will be effective in improving American education; and American education is in dire need of the improvement which co-operation can produce.

Fear is the enemy of improvement in education. It was for this reason that once, in suggesting ten commandments for college presidents, I made *courage* the first and the great commandment. What we are too timid to attempt alone, although we know that it is the promising thing to do, we may find courage to tackle if others will join us in the effort. A joint approach to the task of improving the structure and the functions and the aims of higher education is full of promise for the future of higher education in these United States today.

## UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACE THE FUTURE<sup>1</sup>

KEYES D. METCALF

WE ARE here today to dedicate a building which is a noteworthy forward step in library co-operation. I am proud and honored to have been selected to represent the outside library world. I take it that I was chosen because, some ten years ago, it was my good fortune to supervise a study, made by John Fall, of the New York Public Library, of the need for a regional library in the Middle West.<sup>2</sup> At that time I spent a day with the men who were then presidents of thirteen midwestern universities, a group that was struggling with the problem of inter-university co-operation. I must confess with some chagrin that many of the librarians of those universities were then opposed to a regional library, while the university presidents were, on the whole, favorably inclined toward the proposal. Funds were not available, and the project was held in abeyance for a happier time. In the last decade, most of those presidents have retired, as have most of the head librarians who were then in office. The change in presidents did not result in a different attitude toward the proposal. Happily, the change in librarians did.

Some of us are inclined to think that the world moves slowly as far as co-operation is concerned, but the fact that we are here today to dedicate this Center is the best of evidence that librarians,

at least, have taken long strides during the last ten years.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate those concerned with the planning and construction of this building, particularly on two counts. First, on its appearance: it is a noteworthy addition to library architecture at its best. You can all be pleased by it and proud of it. Second, on its economical construction: it was built at no greater cost per thousand volumes housed than was estimated by the University of Chicago's architect ten years ago, when building costs were about half what they are today, and that, I assure you, is no mean feat.

I was asked to speak on the subject "University Libraries Face the Future," and I suppose that the title was assigned because I ventured to speak at the dedication of the Lamont Library at Harvard two years ago on "The Harvard Library Faces the Future." That was a difficult task, but to speak adequately for university libraries in general is much more difficult. The program calls my talk "Inter-Library Co-operation and the Future." What I have to say will, I think, fit either title.

The first and most obvious thing to say about the university libraries of the future is that they will continue to grow. Some of us have spent a good share of our lives trying to increase the size of libraries and have perhaps failed to realize that one of the easiest things we could do was to make our libraries grow rapidly. Library growth reminds me of

<sup>1</sup> A paper presented at the dedication ceremony of the Midwest Inter-Library Center on October 5, 1951.

<sup>2</sup> John Fall, "A Proposal for a Middle West Deposit Library" (MS in the New York Public Library, New York, N.Y.).

the Sorcerer's Apprentice, who turned on the water but didn't know the combination with which to turn it off and so was swamped by the results. That is now happening to many of us, and, while we still enjoy the swimming, we are beginning to be worried about the future. I often say that one of my duties at Harvard—perhaps the most important of them—is to keep its library from growing as fast as it has grown in the past. So far I must confess that I have failed miserably.

One way to describe the growth of libraries is to observe that we have as many university libraries today in this country with over 1,000,000 volumes as we had in 1920 with over 250,000—fourteen in each case. During the same period, the annual expenditures for books for these libraries have more than tripled, rising from an average of less than \$75,000 for each to about \$245,000, and the money spent for staff salaries has gone up from a little over \$100,000 for each library to something approaching \$500,000. While I hope that we shall not grow so rapidly, percentage-wise, in volumes and in money used for staff and books in the next thirty years as we did in the last thirty, I think it not unreasonable to expect that in 1980 we shall have *more* libraries with 2,000,000 volumes than we had in 1920 with 250,000.

Libraries will grow in size, and, as one result of that growth, they will require more and more money. This cannot help meaning that, as we face the future, we are going to have financial problems. Perhaps we had better speak plainly and say that we shall be in financial difficulty. No library, even in the boom days of the late twenties or the somewhat similar period immediately after World War II, ever seemed

to have all the funds that its librarian would have liked to have at his disposal. We always want more money for more books, and then more space to take care of those books. We want to spend more money for cataloging not only because there are more books to catalog but because the cost of cataloging increases as the library grows larger and also because there is a tendency on our part to want to do more and better cataloging. You may call this a beneficent or a perversive tendency, as you like, but it costs money for staff and, incidentally, for space for the staff. Then, for some reason or other, the better the librarian, the better service to the students and faculty he wants to give, and the students and faculty apparently do not object to better service if it is made available.

So it seems to me obvious that, as we face the future, there will be a constant demand for larger budgets. But there must be a limit to the funds that we can, or for that matter should, put into our libraries. For a large part of the last thirty years we have been living in an age of economic expansion—of great university building programs and of rapidly growing student enrolments—and, as a result, we have not realized so fully as we should that in our libraries we have a section of our universities that tends, year in and year out, in good times and bad, to increase in size and cost geometrically, while the rest of the institution grows arithmetically. It is obvious that this cannot go on without the library's taking an ever increasing percentage of our total resources. That, expressed in other terms, means that, if we have a fairly stable economic situation—that is, if we have a return to "normalcy" and if our libraries are permitted to continue to



grow as they have in the past—each year (and I put it as dramatically as possible) professors will have to be dropped so that the money from their salaries can be spent for library purposes. This, I submit, may very well turn out to be an untenable situation from the over-all educational point of view, one not desirable for the university or, for that matter, for the library itself. Sooner or later we shall find that there is a limit to the percentage of the funds in each university that can be properly spent for the library. As far as I know, there has never been an adequate study made of this problem. The figures should, of course, vary in different institutions. One that is interested primarily in the scientific and technological fields and spends a large share of its funds for its laboratories should, other things being equal, use a smaller percentage for its libraries than an institution that specializes in the humanities and the social sciences. An institution that emphasizes its graduate work and has a large research faculty will require larger library expenditures than an institution that is primarily undergraduate in character. Even if a formula were found on which to base library expenditures, it would have to be interpreted with great discretion and changed from time to time. The percentage should undoubtedly be increased when a new library building is constructed and then should decrease (very gradually, of course), as the years go on. In times such as we have been going through during the last five years, when, rightly or wrongly, clerical and professional library salaries—because of the market rate of pay—increase more rapidly than the salaries of professors, library expenditures inevitably increase more rapidly than those of the institution as a

whole, if service standards are to be kept up.

We have recently had a study known as "The Public Library Inquiry," sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation and the American Library Association. I suggest that it would be desirable to have the library situation in colleges and universities studied in a similar manner, and one of the important points to be considered should be the proper relationship of library expenditures to those of other parts of an institution.

If such an inquiry is made, I do not know what the results will be. Undoubtedly, some institutions will find that they are not spending enough for their libraries and should be urged to appropriate more. Others will find that they are already spending as much as can properly be devoted to the library without interfering unduly with the rest of the university's educational program, and a few may discover that their libraries have overexpanded. But I am sure that, in the years ahead, we are going to have to consider more seriously than in the past the rate of library growth which we encourage or permit, the total size of the accumulation of books that we gather together, and, finally, the whole question of the weeding-out of our collections. We may well set an outside figure on the number of books that we can afford to keep on our campuses. We should study the cost of weeding and the methods to be used in determining the books that may be discarded. We should plan our catalogs and records in such a way that we can "de-catalog" a book less expensively than is now the case. In brief, when we have found the proper level of library expenditures in relation to the rest of the institution, we must manage to stick to it; and, to do this, I am sure that we



must have more inter-library co-operation than we have ever had in the past.

I have talked for a long time in order to provide a background for the main points that I want to make. As we face the future, with larger libraries, greater costs, and more financial troubles, we must have more inter-library co-operation along many lines. We must, for instance, go forward with co-operative storage in libraries such as this one, particularly when by so doing we can eliminate little-used, unnecessary duplicates; but we must not stop there and think of the Midwest Inter-Library Center as solely or even primarily a storage library for little-used books, because that is only a part of the picture.

I think that, ultimately, there should be, in addition to the Midwest Inter-Library Center, a number of other regional libraries, one in the Northeast, one near Washington in which the federal libraries should join, one somewhere in the South, and one in the far West. I hope that all these will be available not just to a limited number of libraries that take the initiative in starting them but to any library that is ready to co-operate and pay its fair share of the costs. In this connection let me add that, when institutions use collections brought together and financed by others, they must expect to pay their way directly or indirectly.

In addition to these regional libraries, I believe that we should have less pretentious and more local institutions, such as the New England Deposit Library, to house material that does not require on-campus storage but should not be too far away. These deposit libraries have their place. They have many important features, but their scope is limited, and they cannot take

the place of the regional libraries. There might well be one of them in every large metropolitan center. I hope that the whole group of regional and deposit libraries will work closely together. I am sure that their collections should be recorded in the Union Catalog of the Library of Congress and that they should co-operate closely with the national library.

As I have already indicated, we should not stop with co-operative storage, and I am very glad to learn that the Midwest Inter-Library Center considers storage less important than joint acquisition programs. We must have such programs, both in connection with and separate from the regional libraries, programs through which fewer copies of books that will obviously be little used are purchased in the beginning, thereby saving cataloging, storage, and purchase costs and freeing funds for other, much needed books not now available. The Farmington Plan, even if it develops much farther than it has as yet, should be considered as only one step in this program. Some of these programs should be connected with the regional libraries, but others may be the result of unilateral agreements between libraries within a region, as there are some collections that are more suitably stored in a university library than in a regional library. In this connection, however, I think it will often be easier to persuade libraries to join in a regional plan than to agree on co-operative acquisition arrangements with another library that may have been a rival in the past. A neutral center, such as a regional library, should be helpful.

We must forget as far as possible about inter-library rivalry. We have gone a long way in this direction already by realizing that no one library

can have everything and that unnecessary duplication of little-used books among libraries reduces the total research resources of the country and just does not make sense. On the other hand, we must realize that we cannot cure undesirable rivalry any more than race prejudice by going too fast or by being arbitrary in dealing with it and thereby arousing passions. It may well be that it would be better, theoretically, for Harvard to send its Gutenberg Bible and its Bay Psalm Book to Chicago, because Yale has a copy of each, but I doubt that we would promote inter-library co-operation at Harvard by proposing it.

We must not forget about microfilming, when that will help, or about microcards or microprints. I believe that there is a place for all three of these methods of photographic reproduction. Microfilming should be considered primarily when a single copy, or a very limited number of copies, is required. I might interpolate at this point my belief that microfilm would have come into wider use in the last decade if we had been wise enough to make it, particularly for reproductions other than newspapers, in sheet form somewhat similar to "microprints" or microcards instead of in reels. Microcards and microprints are edition methods. They are not economical for a very few copies because of the cost of making the original master negative, but they are suitable if a large edition can be printed at once and advance orders can be arranged.

This brings me to another interpolation which seems appropriate. It has been suggested for many years that microreproductions of one kind or another should, in the long run, replace a large part of our library collections

and that these copies could be made available for less than it would cost to store the original volumes in co-operative storage warehouses. Expressed in a different way, the theory is that it costs as little for each of a group of libraries to own a microreproduction as it does for the group to share the cost of housing the original. I have yet to be convinced, with the high labor costs of today, that microreproductions are cheaper than the storage of an original already in hand and stored under inexpensive conditions, unless fifty copies or more of the reproduction can be sold without great sales expense. I suggest that further study be made of this problem.

Neither am I ready to propose that *all* originals of materials that have been reproduced photographically should be discarded, but replacement of the originals in many libraries should be considered, if it can be proved that the savings are great. If the library already owns a bound volume, the saving made by buying a photographic reproduction may be negligible, and, as I have always said, we shall rarely, if ever, find it possible for any library to replace a large part of its collection by microfilm. But if not one of a group of libraries owns a volume, the cataloging, binding, and storage costs, as well as its purchase price, should be considered. We may well find, then, that if microreproduction is kept in mind from the beginning and the material is copied for a number of libraries at once, microreproductions will prove to be even more useful and economical than we have already found them.

We must, incidentally, consider the acquisition of material that is used heavily for a short time and infrequently thereafter. This may deserve

only temporary cataloging and storage; and, when the proper time has come, we may dispose of it and rely on microfilm copies, with perhaps one copy of the original for the whole group of libraries.

This logically brings us to a kind of co-operation that has been neglected up to this time, namely, the co-operative acquisition of master-microfilm copies of bulky sets of little-used material, such as some foreign and state public documents. Those of us who have had our own microfilm programs have been inclined to try to sell as many copies of the film as possible, so as to reduce the cost for each copy, and have failed to realize that the net cost to the library would be less if a group of libraries split among them the cost of making master-negatives and then made it possible for each of them to acquire or borrow a positive of any part of the microfilmed material when it was needed. This may be a field of great importance for a library such as this one.

Some of us will object, of course, to this, as well as to all kinds of co-operative storage, on the basis that most material is of little use unless it is actually under our roofs at the time it is called for. Here I think we shall have to realize that we can no longer afford to store in our own buildings all the material that we may want. This is a fact that must be emphasized if the Midwest Inter-Library Center is to be a success. Our scholars will have to be content in many cases to wait twenty-four or even forty-eight hours for books or reproductions of books. It may be inconvenient, it may require a change in work habits, but it is practicable for most of us; and our methods of research will have to be adapted to current conditions just as they were in the

past, when many of our scholars had to wait for years until they could make a trip abroad to see the books and manuscripts they needed. The choice may be between having several million additional volumes available on one or two days' notice and having a small fraction of that number under our own roofs.

I am sure we must continue the struggle to find better ways and means to carry on co-operative cataloging so as to hold down expenses in that field. This is another problem that we have by no means solved as yet. The Library of Congress cataloging takes care, to a very considerable extent, of the needs of our smaller university and college and public libraries. This, unfortunately, is not true for our great research libraries, and many of us have found that joining in co-operative cataloging as well as adapting Library of Congress cards resulted in additional expense rather than saving. I think that the time has come for a new study of the co-operative cataloging situation and for a report on it to the research libraries of the country.

Indeed, a full-scale study of the whole cataloging situation in research libraries is in order. While it is not difficult to argue that the larger the library, the more detailed the cataloging should be and the higher the standards used, it is also not difficult to prove that spending as much for cataloging as many of us now do prevents us from acquiring additional books and pamphlets that might be even more valuable to research workers than higher cataloging standards.

A third cataloging problem which must be faced within a generation is whether the card catalog which we have come to take for granted has not

reached a state where it will begin to break down of its own weight in our larger libraries. I believe that we shall always have card catalogs for our recently published material, but I am not at all sure that we shall not find it more economical and convenient and more useful for research, in the long run, if a number of our largest institutions, in addition to the Library of Congress, print catalogs in book form for older material, either independently or, better still, jointly.

Another problem on which I feel that special study is required is the question of fees for library use by those who have no official connection with the institution owning the volume required. Such use might include requests for inter-library loan as well as use in person. I think that most of us have felt in the past that there should be completely free use of material by any research worker, but I am not so sure that we are going to be able to promote inter-library co-operation of the kind that I have outlined if a few libraries carry most of the burden of the cost of acquisition, cataloging, storage, and service of material and then find that the use of the books is largely by others. We may well find that a reasonable system of charges for use by outsiders would, in the long run, encourage library co-operation and joint acquisition programs. This problem may prove to be one of the most important and difficult ones to be faced by the Midwest Inter-Library Center.

All these points which I have discussed seem to me to be of importance, but there is another matter which I cannot refrain from mentioning and for which I have no solution. I am inclined to think that it may be more serious and more important than all the other

matters which I have taken up put together, but it is one that we are prone to forget. Every year that goes by brings closer the time when a large percentage of the printed material in our great research libraries will have reached a stage so near to disintegration that further use may destroy it. Our public and college libraries, on the whole, will not have to worry about this problem, for the books that they must have are mostly modern and replaceable, and it is easy to arrange to replace books needed by a good many libraries; but there are millions of different titles on poor paper in our larger libraries of which few copies are available, and, though these are not worth reprinting, we ought not to let them disappear off the face of the earth. Microfilming, of course, will help. It has largely solved this problem with newspapers, but it and other ameliorating plans have not even scratched the surface of the main problem. Are we ready to join Louis XV and simply say, "After us the deluge! Let our successors face the problem of paper disintegration"?

Finally, we must make a special effort to eliminate as far as possible the further building-up, and in many cases the continuance, of large duplicate collections of very specialized, little-used material. Why should a single section of the country have three large collections of Friesian literature, old textbooks, or material on Egyptology, for instance?

This question, alas, cannot be answered by librarians working alone or with one another. It will have to be answered on an inter-university level by the top university administrative officers. A library is primarily a service institution. If a university insists on giving advanced work in Egyptology,

it is up to its librarian to furnish the material required, in spite of the fact that there may be two or three other universities in the region, each trying to specialize in Egyptology, each with only one or two students in the field, and each with a large and expensive library collection on the subject. But the decision is in the hands of the university, and it would seem to me that the heads of the universities must get together and make firm commitments for specialization in such fields as those just mentioned. Division of fields on the university level, not just that of the library, is one of the best possible ways to relieve financial pressure for the libraries and for universities as a group, and it should release library funds and funds for instruction that can be put to better use in fields not now covered in the same part of the country, if at all.

Let me now attempt to summarize what I have said. As university libraries face the future, they must take into consideration the fact that libraries will continue to grow, that they will require larger and larger budgets, and that money will be short. Libraries cannot continue to grow as in the past without taking a larger and larger share of the resources of their institutions, unless we can bring about more inter-library and inter-university co-operation. That co-operation should include:

1. A careful inquiry into the library costs and their proper relationship to the total expenses of the institution
2. Regional and deposit libraries for the storage of little-used collections
3. Joint acquisition programs, going on from the Farmington Plan, in which regional libraries should take a leading part
4. Promotion of library co-operation in the field of microreproduction
5. A study of co-operative cataloging methods, including the question of printing catalogs in book form
6. An investigation of the desirability of fees for inter-library use
7. An attack on the paper disintegration problem
8. Consideration of the division of fields among universities, not just by libraries but by the top-level university officers as a group

I propose that foundation aid be solicited to finance a study of these problems by a competent outside group and that it be sponsored by the American Association of Universities and the Association of Research Libraries. I further suggest that the Midwest Inter-Library Center would provide a first-class background for much of the work and that one of the results of the study might well be the development of the next regional library.



## THE SCHOLAR LOOKS AT INTER-LIBRARY CO-OPERATION<sup>1</sup>

THEODORE C. BLEGEN

THE scholar is not an Emersonian abstraction. He is not a machine. Nor is he a gaunt and lonely folklore figure dwelling on an upper floor of a mythical tower of ivory. He is a human being selectively trained for his job and doing it in collaboration with others. As he probes into his special problems, he is informed by, and sensitive to, a thousand influences, past and present. Deny to him the fruits of thought and discovery and invention through past ages, and you turn him into a derelict. Cut him off from association with colleagues, whether speaking through their physical voices or through the pages of their recorded thought, and you rob his work of its vitality. Limit his freedom of access to, and use of, the materials, supplies, equipment, and background information for his research, and you cripple his efforts.

He is instructed by the past and invited by the future, as Emerson says, but he is also aided or hindered by the present—aided if his working conditions are good, hindered if they are bad. Never the forlorn and isolated figure that legend has made him out to be, he is today more sharply aware than ever before of the importance of working with others. This has been forced upon him by his own specialization, the interconnections of science, the tendency of problems to overlap conventional disciplines, and the importance of relating the part to the whole. For

himself the scholar may paraphrase the English poet and preacher John Donne and say, "No scholar is an island, entire of itself. Every scholar is a piece of the universe, a part of the mainland of human search for truth in all its manifold interrelations."

And so the American scholar today is joining research teams, tackling co-operative enterprises, building bridges to other disciplines, and exploring the interstitial areas. No emphasis upon, or trend toward, co-operation can ever lessen the need for original thinking and individual intellectual integrity; but the compulsions of human understanding coupled with the nature of modern scholarship point to an ever greater reliance upon community effort in scholarship, with one skill buttressing another in the effort to solve problems in the complex and interwoven human and natural universe.

Thus scholarship, embracing the spirit and using the techniques of co-operation, is leaguering itself with the future—to use the words of Ibsen—and this is a part of the setting of the dramatic inter-library venture that universities and libraries of the Middle West are here initiating. But only a part. For looming up behind this enterprise and informing the mood of contemporary scholarship is a conviction that research is critical to our future, of vital urgency, and in need of every support within our power. We know all too well that, with our land frontiers subdued, unconquered frontiers—scientific, social, economic, humane, educational—confront

<sup>1</sup> A paper presented at the dedication ceremony of the Midwest Inter-Library Center on October 5, 1951.

us. Research is unquestionably the pioneering of the modern age. We know also that, in the dark shadow of two world wars and in the shade or sunlight of far-reaching new scientific discoveries, this age is studded with problems as grave in their implications as they seem various and endless.

Nearly everybody pays lip service to research. It stirs the imagination and provokes many figures of speech. People call it professional lifeblood, the opening of new frontiers, the invasion of fields, the fighting of battles, the conquest of visible and invisible enemies, a race against time. But all too many people think of research as magic—and, of course, magic needs nothing but a wand. Research is no magic, however—it employs no incantations, it has no bag of tricks. It is work, trained work, hard work, work done in freedom. And it imperatively needs facilities of many kinds, including books made accessible by all the means and devices of library science. Certainly, the universities and libraries co-operating in this enterprise are under no illusion that scholars produce their results by waving wands. They understand that our most vital research need is for fundamental investigation—something that Congress, in its failure to come quickly and generously to the support of the National Science Foundation, shows that it does not understand.

I cannot take part in this symposium without underlining another need of our time focused upon books and their use. This is the need to reinforce and extend the efforts of organized education to communicate the findings of research and reflection to a very wide public. An unused library is entombed eloquence and wisdom. Scholarship that does not ultimately make impact in

some form on the public mind is little more than antiquarianism. Research, as Edith Cavell said of patriotism, is not enough.

Not long ago I participated in the Corning conference,<sup>2</sup> the central idea of which was that our people almost desperately need to absorb and understand the largely unused or undistilled values in the humanities. We have rich treasures of mind and spirit that few share. Our shelves are crowded with books of importance whose message does not reach the people. Representatives of industry, business, and the academic world met around conference tables at Corning to consider some of these humane values, most of them already probed by a scholarship that, more often than not, wraps its thinking into bundles of jargon. The conference believed that these values should be unwrapped and sent out into the life of America today. Who can say what the next step in the advance of civilization will be? It may be a new medicine, a new poem, a new symphony, a workable plan for peace. It could possibly be the translation of the best fruits of scholarship, notably in the humane areas, into the common understanding and possession of millions. The task is one for scholarship, perhaps an essentially new kind of scholarship; and, when it is undertaken in full force, you may be sure that the books of inter-library centers, here and elsewhere in the regions of America, will be as pure gold to the miner.

How does the scholar look at inter-library co-operation? Who can say? No

<sup>2</sup> Conference on "Living in Industrial Civilization" held at Corning, N.Y., May 17-19, 1951. This conference was jointly sponsored by the Corning Glass Works and the American Council of Learned Societies as part of the centenary celebration of the Corning Glass Works.



one can speak for all the scholars of the Midwest or of America. They have no common voice, no chosen spokesman, and I have some slight doubt that they would acknowledge a dean as their representative—particularly a graduate dean, who, as Howard Mumford Jones has said, is the “head of a school that does not exist and of a faculty that never meets,” who “does nothing in particular but is subjected to heavy criticism unless he does it very well.” As chairman of a university library committee, I have interested myself for a decade in the library as an integral part of the main-line educational program of a university. But I suspect that my chief claim—if any—for voicing the viewpoint of scholars is that I have shared some of their typical experiences. *Et in Arcadia ego*. I have hunted books and manuscripts. I have explored libraries and archives. I have taken notes to the ultimate, the arthritic, point. I have searched in vain for a book in my own library and then, after long reconnoitering, discovered a copy of it in the University of Illinois, not used by anyone for twenty-three years. I have scouted various European libraries, employing their quaint medieval catalogs with silent prayer and a hope that intuition plus American luck would come to my rescue. So, after such experiences and with a choice collection of frustrations, I thank God for some genuine inter-library co-operation, even if the pool for immersion is some four hundred miles from my own campus.

This inter-library center cannot fail to be of service to American scholarship. Research people, now undergoing intensive schooling in the arts of co-operation, should welcome a great central pool of materials for their own use, with riches pouring into it from fifteen

or more co-operating institutions. They know that, with an enlarging Niagara of books and documents rushing out from the presses of the world, no university can buy or beg or harbor everything. If it did, and then processed it all, the outcome would be the channeling of the entire university budget to the library—the faculty uncomfortably left with tenure minus salary. There are—there must be—limitations upon library expansion. But these limitations apply to all our libraries. No university has an unlimited budget. Meanwhile, there is unnecessary duplication everywhere. Everywhere there is needless competition. Everywhere there is unplanned expense in the struggle to meet special needs, often of a temporary character. Everywhere there are research projects for which a given library does not have the necessary materials at hand—materials which, though they may be duplicated in the little-used resources of another library, can be built up independently only at substantial expense and with painful delay. And it may well be that in some places research projects—at least at a certain level—now confine themselves mainly to materials immediately available, whereas the use of the resources of a central collection, reasonably convenient of access, might give them more flesh and blood.

The scholar, looking at inter-library co-operation, will, I believe, hail this center as a desirable pool of research materials for the entire midwestern region. He will view it as a potential enrichment of the research resources for the region as a whole, available to him and to his students. Looking to a long future, he will see it as steadily growing in productive promise. But, trained to raise questions in his own research

province, he will pose certain questions about this enterprise. Will basic decisions on policy be attuned to the true needs of scholarship and education? How will books be selected? Along what lines will the collection be built? Will university administrations, mindful of the economies attendant upon a central pool, continue to treat university library budget problems with a sense of urgency and of fundamental educational and research need? What delays will be encountered in the use of some obscure item which, in the old days, might have been found, easily and quickly, on the university library shelves? Will there be any appreciable loss to research through the removal of books from customary shelves, where, in casual inspection, a scholar comes across material to which even the best guides might not afford recognizable clues?

Scholars will ask these and other questions, not as objections but as cautions and perhaps as guides. If the project involves some loss or disadvantage, it will be more than offset by gain and advantage. My imagination is stirred when I think of fragmentary, incomplete, little-used collections merging with related materials from other institutions and being rounded out and enriched. If the center continues to confine itself to little-used materials and to serving scholars efficiently through the participating libraries, most of the skepticism—if, indeed, there is any—will be blown away. If there should occur a delay of a day or two in getting one's hand on a book that might have been found in a few minutes in one's own library, consider the offsetting advantages in quick, efficient, inter-library communication for scores of items; in the creation of new bibliographical tools; and

in the increasing chance of finding not only the particular book wanted but also rare and important associated items, perhaps in some instances micro-filmed from unique copies.

Are we not moving in the direction of an integrated system of library resources for the entire country, with the elimination of unneeded duplicates in regions like the Midwest, with the filling-in of important areas now inadequately collected, and with the development of bibliographical controls that surpass anything yet achieved?

In appraising the Center, scholarship will give thought to yet other large issues for the future, for certain problems of strategy cannot fail to be brought into the light of scrutiny by the lessons of successful inter-library co-operation. The truth is that unneeded duplication, confusion, and fragmentary service in the libraries reflect like conditions in the universities on the educational and research fronts. Co-operation in one segment of inter-university relationships invites consideration of its advantageous spread to other segments. For research and graduate education, this means asking ourselves some probing and possibly disturbing questions. What are the values and prospects of joint endeavor? Are universities spreading themselves too thin? Do they offer to do more than they can actually do with high competence? What can individual institutions do very well and within the limits of their resources? Can they work out co-operative agreements with other institutions?

Such questions are not wholly theoretical to me, for I have helped to promote a modest arrangement with a neighboring university for co-operation in one field of study, with a division of

specialization, flexible conditions for the intermigration of students, joint conferences, and an alternating of summer sessions on two campuses. But universities thus far have done relatively little to eliminate unrewarding duplication and competition and to advance rewarding joint recognitions or allocations of specialization. The problem is difficult, for no good university is static. Universities change. Their emphases do not remain the same, decade after decade—and few would argue that they should. No co-operative plan, in research or in education, will succeed which does not take into account the viable character of university educa-

tion, its dynamic quality as an ongoing institution, its flexible adjustment to changing objectives.

But perhaps the difficulties are only challenges to our resourcefulness. Meanwhile, this Center, notwithstanding obstacles that faced the idea a decade ago, is a reality. Stephen Vincent Benét, in the opening line of *Western Star*, says "Americans are always moving on." Today, in this dedication, we move on to new ground, new furrows, new crops. The job we tackle is one in which we—libraries, universities, scholars—work together toward a common harvest. As Mama says in *I Remember Mama*, "Is good."

## TASKS OF THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE<sup>1</sup>

RALPH E. ELLSWORTH

IT WOULD be a rash librarian indeed who thought that his solutions to the specific tasks facing the Midwest Inter-Library Center would appear reasonable the day after tomorrow, or even tomorrow. The amount of thinking, talking, committee-sitting, and plain old-fashioned bickering among fallible university presidents and librarians that has been necessary to bring us this far—and a truly small distance it is—is an unhappy thing to reflect upon for anyone who knows how much remains to be done. We are like mountain-climbers in unexplored territory, who, at great cost, gain one peak, only to discover that it is merely a shoulder to another, distant, higher, and more formidable range.

But as we sit here catching our breath and enjoying the newly revealed views and the sensation of having arrived, we are—as are all true mountain-climbers—compelled by those higher peaks and by the uneasy realization that even they may not be the last. Librarianship is one profession that has not found all the answers. Some of us wonder if it has found any.

As I see it, it is the task of those of us now in office to be occupied with the first level of immediate problems: those of relating the tools and services of each of our libraries to the Center and to the other libraries in the new entity—a group of strong universities trying to become stronger through unity. These

problems are well known to all of us who have been wrestling with them during the last decade.

The first and, I suppose, the most stubborn is that of enlarging our sense of professional loyalties from a one-institution basis to a base that causes us to think first and always of the needs of each scholar in the region. This sounds easy and slightly un-American, but I can assure you that it is neither. At the moment, our universities are headed by a group of presidents who are intelligently determined to put intellectualism back into our universities. The least that is expected of us, as librarians, would be, it seems to me, some evidence, in the form of good works, that librarians are interested in the welfare of scholarship in this area. We can provide this evidence by creating an abundance of the records of scholarship by means of this Center. And how do you go about the task of enlarging the members' loyalties? By giving them practice in participation.

The second immediate task facing us is that of reasoning with our faculties and helping them understand the necessity of this Center. This is a very large order, and it is about all that the present generation of librarians will have time to do. As Mr. Metcalf has said, scholars of two generations ago usually had to wait for years until they could make the trip to Europe to consult the sources. Today our Center can make it possible for us to shorten this delay to a day or two, but that will not impress the faculty member who has forgotten his

<sup>1</sup> A paper presented at the dedication ceremony of the Midwest Inter-Library Center on October 5, 1951.

predecessor's predicaments and is in no mood to be reasonable about this Center, which to him appears to be another whim of librarians to keep him from his books. This would seem to be our opportunity. May we be granted patience, eloquence, and thick calluses where needed.

The third project we can and should tackle at once is that of building a substantial book budget with which to purchase *new* titles and which will contribute to the research resources of the area. Co-operative storage of publications is not the main purpose of this association. Co-operative acquisition and planning are.

Already we can see the benefits of co-operative acquisition. The Center is about to enter microfilm subscriptions to forty foreign newspapers. This will enable each of us to discard back files of these papers. No one of us can afford to purchase all the patent reports published each year, even though these are needed. But we can afford to purchase a microcard file in the Center for all of us. These are minor illustrations of the principle. But we shall not be able to apply the principles unless our points of view coincide and unless our faculties approve.

Fourth, we should begin at once to survey the special collection resources of the region and to strengthen each existing special collection, wherever it is, by gathering up the scattered fragments that each of us may possess and concentrating these in one place to make a single strong research resource. Each of us now possesses one or more of such collections, so the problem of undue concentration in one library will not prove to be a handicap.

Fifth, once we have solved these four problems, we can try to develop special

services at the Center that can be offered more economically there than in individual libraries. Translating, central processing, microcopying, and publishing are examples of the type of services I mean.

Finally, if depression ever hits our universities, they may be able to tackle the problem of allocating special fields of research among the member-universities. How many library schools does the region need? How many departments of classical languages, schools of social work, medical colleges, etc.? It is heresy even to mention this today. Tomorrow it may not be.

These are a few of the tasks we have at hand—primarily matters of relating the tools and services of each of our libraries to the Center and to the other libraries in the region. But shortly it will be clear to all that these rather minor matters will be overshadowed by others arising out of the relationships among this and similar centers in other parts of the country and between all the centers and the Library of Congress. We see already that this second level of library problems is immensely more complex than the one we now occupy, and we are eager to reach it.

For example, it is obvious now that we are nearing the end of the present system of individually compiled library catalogs. The transitional problems involved in getting from where we are to where we can use the Library of Congress printed catalogs—author, title, and subject—in an economical relationship to our local records are now slightly beyond our grasp. We must also find out how the relationships between each university library and regional centers and the Library of Congress can be affected by the use of teletype and other automatic machinery for sorting,

counting, copying, and transporting books within the region and among the several regions.

The scope of these problems is national, and yet each must be analyzed and evaluated by the simple and undramatic test of what it means to the intellectual welfare of the solitary scholar. The fact that we can make early attacks on these problems means that we are in the first stages of developing a national system of library service for the twentieth-century scholar.

We librarians know that we must not make the mistake of trying to solve the library problems in our region on a

regional basis alone. Each must be evaluated in its national as well as its regional setting. We resent this fact, but we shall not be able to escape it.

I am aware that, once we have solved our local, regional, and national problems, we shall merely have laid the groundwork for the international ones that lie ahead, but they can be postponed a while. When these are finally solved, there will probably be nothing more to do, but let us not be too sure. In the meanwhile, while we gaze at the stars, it is well for us to remember that we have a little work to do here in the Midwest.



## THE PIERPONT MORGAN LIBRARY<sup>1</sup>

GEORGE K. BOYCE

OF THE great American collectors who were active at the close of the last century and the first decade of this, J. Pierpont Morgan (1837-1913) was the most catholic in his tastes. Not only did he assemble notable collections in a dozen departments of the fine arts, but his acquisitions of books and manuscripts covered an unusually wide range, from examples of some of the earliest written records (clay tablets and papyri) to first editions of authors who were his own contemporaries. This breadth of interest has determined to a considerable degree the nature of the present Morgan Library.

### THE BUILDING OF THE COLLECTIONS

The idea of collecting did not come to Pierpont Morgan only with his great wealth. Among the earliest recorded activities of his boyhood is his autograph-hunting. In his early teens he set out to gather specimens of the handwriting of the notable figures of his time and to obtain as many as possible by the simple expedient of writing and asking for them. In this way he acquired, for example, the autograph of President Fillmore. More original and more fruitful was his interest in the autographs of the outstanding men of his own church. In 1851-52 he received,

in response to his own requests, 6 letters from bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church, one of them addressed to "Master" Pierpont Morgan. These autographs form, in a very real sense, the cornerstone of the manuscript collections of the Library, for Morgan gradually enlarged his collection from those simple beginnings into one of the major gatherings of original manuscript materials for the history of the Episcopal church in America.

Though we hear little of Mr. Morgan's continuing interest in books and manuscripts until after he was firmly established in the banking world of New York, we know that he assembled a library, for in 1883 he issued a brief catalog of it, prepared by the bookseller J. F. Sabin. Therein we find enumerated a rather undistinguished list of books, probably typical of the libraries of upper-class families of the 1880's. It comprised some 160 titles or groups of books, among them a few that stand out as unusual, a number of good letters and documents—of Robert Burns, Alexander Hamilton, and George Washington, for example—and one of the finest collections of autographs of the signers of the Declaration of Independence then in existence. His best printed book was a magnificent copy of Eliot's Indian Bible of 1663.

At about this time Mr. Morgan came into possession of his first literary manuscript of outstanding importance. At the London sale of the library of the Earl of Clare in 1881, Junius S. Mor-

<sup>1</sup> For assistance in preparing this survey I am greatly indebted to all my colleagues on the staff of the Morgan Library, in particular to Felice Stampfle, who has contributed the section on the Department of Prints and Drawings, of which she is curator.



gan, Pierpont's father, had obtained the original manuscript of Sir Walter Scott's *Guy Mannering*, which he later presented to his son. From that beginning has grown one of the most distinguished collections of the Library. Morgan's enthusiasm for literary and historical manuscripts of paramount importance developed rapidly as he found his holdings increasing. In 1890 he purchased 2 volumes of manuscripts relating to the trial of Warren Hastings, two years later his second set of the "signers," and in 1895 the holograph of Cooper's *The Deerslayer*. By 1897 distinguished manuscripts began to pour in, among them Laurence Sterne's *Letterbook*, Keat's *Endymion*, and 3 more originals from the hand of Scott, including *The Lady of the Lake*. Most of these manuscript acquisitions, be it noted, preceded the building of the great collection of early printed books and were soon overshadowed by Mr. Morgan's purchases of far more costly printed volumes. In 1896 he acquired his first copy of the Gutenberg Bible, printed on vellum; with it, from the London house of Henry Sotheran—such were the opportunities and such was Mr. Morgan's liking for doing things in a big way—arrived copies of each of the first four folios of Shakespeare and the Complutensian Polyglot Bible.

It was not until the last two years of the century that Pierpont Morgan (he was sixty-three years old in 1900) emerged as the foremost American collector of books and manuscripts as well as of objects of art. Between 1899 and 1902 he purchased three large libraries which had been painstakingly assembled by earlier collectors, thereby vastly increasing not only the size but the quality of his library. Of the first of

them, Mr. Morgan had a catalog printed, the *Catalogue of a Collection of Books Formed by James Toovey, Principally from the Library of the Earl of Gosford, the Property of J. Pierpont Morgan* (New York, 1901). That collection was composed of two remarkable groups of rarities: an "extensive and extraordinary assemblage of the productions of the Aldine Press" and a large number of volumes in fine bindings, 68 of which were illustrated in the colored plates of Mr. Morgan's *Catalogue*.

The second large library was that of Theodore Irwin, which brought 4 Caxtons and other fine examples of early printing. It contained also the first illuminated manuscripts of real consequence, including the *Golden Gospels of Henry VIII*, as well as several hundred prints, among them many Rembrandt etchings.

The third of these libraries to be acquired *en bloc*, and in many ways the most important of them, was the Bennett purchase, the supreme quality of which was made known to the world in Mr. Morgan's sumptuous *Catalogue of Manuscripts and Early Printed Books from the Libraries of William Morris, Richard Bennett, Bertram, Fourth Earl of Ashburnham, and Other Sources, Now Forming Portions of the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan* (London, 1906-7). The manuscripts were described in a single volume by Montague Rhodes James, the printed books in three volumes by Alfred W. Pollard and others. The contents will be further illustrated below in discussions of the manuscript and early printed book collections; the catalog itself set a new standard of excellence for bibliographic description of an American library.

Other, smaller collections were sub-

sequently incorporated by Mr. Morgan into his library. Among those that enriched his holdings in new fields were the John E. Kerr collection of medieval chivalry, the George B. De Forest library, rich in French literature, and the outstanding group of literary manuscripts of American authors assembled by Stephen H. Wakeman. None of these collections was kept together as a separate unit; all were broken up and integrated into the growing Morgan library.

To house his library appropriately, Mr. Morgan erected a new building on the plot of land adjoining his residence on Thirty-sixth Street. Charles Follen McKim was the architect, and he undertook the commission with enthusiasm. He had long sought an opportunity to place polished marble block on polished block without benefit of mortar, and this seemed to be his opportunity. But, unfortunately, the climate of New York is not that of Athens, and modifications were required. Moreover, Mr. Morgan's patience was not equal to so slow a process. Yet, in spite of all difficulties, the resulting structure was one of the finest creations of McKim, Mead and White. Built of pinkish Tennessee marble in a modified Renaissance style, the new library was opened in 1906, furnished sumptuously from the huge Morgan art collection. For forty-five years it has served as fitting repository for one of America's most distinguished book collections.

With the death of the great collector, in 1913, the entire library passed to his son, the second J. P. Morgan, who, as he had watched the collections grow, had developed a deep love for the books and manuscripts and a surprisingly detailed knowledge of them. During the ten years of his private ownership, he

made noteworthy additions in most departments, not by acquiring entire collections which another had formed, but by judiciously selecting books and manuscripts of unusual significance which would enhance the educational value of his library.

In 1924 the younger Morgan relinquished his ownership of the Library and all its collections, presenting them, with a sufficient endowment, to a board of trustees, to be administered henceforward as the "Pierpont Morgan Library," a memorial to the great collector. The private collection became thereby an educational institution dedicated to the pleasure and enlightenment of the American public and to the furtherance of study and research by men of all nations. An annex of about the same size as the McKim building was erected by Mr. Morgan to provide space for the additional services required by its dedication to the public interest: exhibition room, reading-room, stacks, and quarters for an enlarged staff. The administration was entrusted to Miss Belle Da Costa Greene, whose name was already inseparably associated with that of the Morgan Library through her twenty years' service as librarian to the J. P. Morgans, father and son.

In 1949 the Library celebrated completion of its first twenty-five years as an educational institution. To mark the occasion and to honor Miss Greene, who had just retired from her post as director, an exhibition was arranged to illustrate the growth of the Library during the quarter-century. In the Introduction to the printed catalog of the exhibition,<sup>2</sup> Dr. Lawrence C. Wroth

<sup>2</sup> *The First Quarter Century of the Pierpont Morgan Library: A Retrospective Exhibition in Honor of Belle Da Costa Greene, with a Tribute*

summarized the achievements of those years under Miss Greene's direction and emphasized her contribution to the creation of the collection and, through them, to the cultural development of the United States.

The Library's second director, Mr. Frederick B. Adams, Jr., has continued to strengthen the collections and to administer them for the benefit of scholars in this country and abroad. The very considerable additions made in the departments of manuscripts, printed books, and drawings during his tenure of less than three years maintain the same high standards of selection that obtained under Miss Greene. His organization of the "Fellows of the Pierpont Morgan Library" has given the Library a new constituency of scholars and connoisseurs, who are granting their support, intellectual and financial, to its program.

#### MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE MANUSCRIPTS

If there is a single field in which the Morgan Library is unquestionably pre-eminent among its fellows, it is that of illuminated manuscripts. Many superlatives have been employed in describing this collection, and there is no need to repeat them here. Suffice it to quote the judgment of one acquainted with manuscript collections the world over, Seymour De Ricci, who said in his brief introduction to the Morgan manuscripts in Volume II of the *Census*: "It [the Morgan Library] now houses both the most extensive and the most beautifully selected series of manuscripts existing on the American Continent, and it may truthfully claim to be superior in general quality to all but three or

four of the greatest national libraries of the Old World."<sup>3</sup>

Though a full, descriptive catalog of these manuscripts has not been published since the collection numbered just over 100 volumes (1906), all (except those acquired since January, 1950) are listed in the *Census* or in its supplement, now in preparation, where the essential facts about each are set forth.

Some account of the growth of the collection, beyond that which De Ricci was able to include in his introduction, is pertinent to a discussion of the Library as a research institution, for the development in this country of an interest in medieval manuscript illumination parallels the building of the Morgan collection, and it is difficult not to conclude that the two phenomena were closely related. According to De Ricci, the first American catalog of any significance in the field of manuscript illumination was that of the Morgan manuscripts, prepared by Montague Rhodes James and published in 1906. With the steady addition of new manuscripts to the collection and the practice of making them available to the general public through a series of exhibitions inaugurated by that held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1924, interest in the art of illuminating began to take hold in America. One index of that interest was the appearance, in the curriculums of several eastern universities, of courses in medieval manuscript miniatures. Those courses implied the existence of scholars competent to teach and students eager to learn about the subject. Most of these courses have, from the beginning, been associated with trips

to the Library and Its First Director by Lawrence C. Wroth (New York, 1949).

<sup>3</sup> Seymour De Ricci, *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1935-40), II, 1359.

of inspection to the Morgan originals.

The first group of manuscripts to come to the Library formed a rather incidental portion of the Toovey collection. They were an undistinguished half-dozen, largely of textual interest, including a Theophrastus and a Xenophon, both in Latin translations and probably acquired by Toovey for their fine bindings. The Irwin purchase brought the next lot, 12 codices of liturgical character (Hours, Missals, etc.), among them the magnificent *Golden Gospels of Henry VIII* (MS 23), the real cornerstone of the collection of fine illuminations. That noble volume then stood alone among its lesser fellows, but only for a year or two, when it was joined by others of comparable merit: the ninth-century Ashburnham Gospels (MS 1), whose gold and jeweled covers of Carolingian workmanship vie in excellence with the manuscript itself; and the superb examples of productions of the medieval scriptoria from the Bennett purchase, the finest of which had been selected by William Morris for his own collection. Today one marvels at the opportunity of acquiring in one group so many manuscripts of the highest quality, especially those of the best English period, such as the *Huntingfield* and *Windmill* psalters, the *Tiploft Missal*, and the illustrated *Bestiary* of the twelfth century.

The elder Morgan continued to add manuscripts throughout his lifetime. They could not all boast the same degree of excellence as those mentioned above, but among them were many codices of the first importance, e.g., the eleventh-century *Gospels of Matilda*, Countess of Tuscany, the Spanish Beatus of the thirteenth century, and the fragmentary Pliny the Younger of the sixth.

Like the Pliny, many of the manuscripts were of importance for their text rather than for their miniatures. Among these may be mentioned the volumes of French medieval romances obtained as part of the Kerr collection; the early English texts of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate; the St. Augustine written in Merovingian script of the seventh century; the eleventh-century Hincmar; and the *Chronicles* of the Scottish writer Hector Boece.

When the Library passed to the ownership of the younger J. P. Morgan, the illuminated manuscripts came to be cherished still more highly. Thanks to his enthusiasm for them and to his informed appreciation of their historical and artistic significance, the Library was enriched by additional manuscripts equal to the best that his father had brought together. Mention of a few of them suffices to illustrate his keen interest and impeccable taste: the ninth-century Spanish Beatus, the Greek Dioscorides of the following century, the Cologne Gospels and two English Gospels, all of the eleventh century, and the Shah Abbas *Old Testament Illustrations* of the thirteenth.

The 200 codices added since the Library was intrusted to a board of trustees testify to the continued zeal for making an excellent collection still better. These newer acquisitions have been described in the successive "Reviews"<sup>4</sup> and need not be enumerated here. The last major addition under the administration of Miss Greene was the renowned Anhalt Gospels; those acquired since the new director succeeded her are

<sup>4</sup> *The Pierpont Morgan Library: A Review of the Activities, Growth, and Development of the Library during the Period 1924-1929* (New York, 1930). This initial report was followed by others covering the years 1930-35, 1936-40, and 1941-48, respectively.

no less distinguished, the Austrian *Missal* from Seitenstetten, the fourteenth-century Bohemian Bible, and the Fouquet *Hours* being worthy newcomers to America's finest collection of illuminated manuscripts.

As regards the use of the Library's materials for research, the manuscript collection represents one of the more active departments. The lists of publications based on, or otherwise utilizing, Morgan materials, which have regularly formed part of the five-year "Reviews," indicate the large proportion of books and articles on paleography and illumination. The Library's policy has been to foster research in this field by making the supporting collection of books second to none. A special aid is the card index of the iconography of the Morgan manuscripts.

There are two sections of early manuscripts which merit particular mention, since they fall outside the scope of the De Ricci *Census*: the ancient papyri and the oriental manuscripts. The papyri were acquired from several sources, the larger part of them from the library of Lord Amherst of Hackney. They fall into three major groups—Egyptian, Greek, and Coptic—each group comprising literary works and documents of historical interest. The Egyptian and the Greek papyri were published in 1899-1901, when in the possession of Lord Amherst (the Egyptian in one volume, the Greek in two). There is one other Greek papyrus of importance, a codex of the *Iliad*, chiefly remarkable for the number of pages (110) of consecutive text preserved together.

The third group, of Coptic manuscripts, is made up of the papyri from the Amherst collection, the Hamouli manuscripts on vellum, and some miscellaneous items and is extremely valu-

able. The Hamouli collection is unique, representing the liturgical library of an Egyptian Coptic monastery of the ninth century and numbering just under 60 volumes. A comprehensive catalog, though long in preparation, is still far from completion. A check list, offering a succinct outline of the entire collection, was published in 1919 by the orientalist, Professor Henry Hyvernat.

Here may be mentioned the Library's collection of Coptic bookbindings, the original bindings in which the Hamouli manuscripts were found, dating from the sixth to the tenth century. They form the subject of a special monograph now in press, the work of a Coptic scholar, the Rev. Dr. Theodore C. Petersen.

The oriental group includes also manuscripts in Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Syriac, Persian, and the languages of India.

#### AUTOGRAPH MANUSCRIPTS AND DOCUMENTS

The second large division of the Library's manuscript collection is that of the autographs and documents, embracing all modern literature and all documents of whatever period, save only those on papyri and those which are, in effect, illuminated manuscripts.

The autographs may be thought of as forming two distinct groups—the literary and the historical. The literary comprises the works of authors writing since the Renaissance, as well as letters and documents by, to, or concerning the authors or their works. Though usually written in the hands of their authors, these manuscripts include copies or transcripts which, for one reason or another, have a special value, such as that of Book I of *Paradise Lost*, for example, which, naturally, is in the



hand of an amanuensis. They cover a chronological range of more than five centuries, from the early fifteenth century to writers now living; they are best considered in national groups, which vary greatly in strength, the English and American being by far the most numerous, the French less so but by no means negligible, and the German and Italian represented by only a few manuscripts each.

The outstanding specimens in each of the groups have been placed on exhibition from time to time, and their presence in this Library is gradually becoming known in scholarly circles. But no catalog of them has ever been published, and none is foreseen in the immediate future. Consequently, a check list of the entire literary collection is now in preparation for publication in an early number of *Publications of the Modern Language Association*. The prospect of soon having before the scholarly world an up-to-date list of the Morgan literary manuscripts renders an extended description here unnecessary. Suffice it to say that nearly every significant English or American writer is represented among them.

It may be of some value as an indication of the size of the collection to record that the bound volumes of the English group number more than 400, the American half that number, and the French about 80. No great significance is to be attached to these figures, since in certain cases a "volume" contains a single document or letter (e.g., the Bunyan imprisonment document of 1674/75 or Keats's twenty-eight-page letter of September, 1819, to his brother George), while in other cases it contains hundreds of pages of letters or a complete work of Byron, Mark Twain, or Balzac. The thousands of unbound

letters and documents in the collections are not included in the count of volumes. Further, it must be remembered that the collection is not limited to the work of writers of the topmost rank; William Harrison Ainsworth, Ford Madox Brown, and F. Hopkinson Smith are represented, as well as Alexander Pope, Dean Swift, and Edgar Allan Poe.

The historical section of the autographs is made up largely of letters and documents, but it occasionally includes a manuscript of book length (the Revolutionary War diary of Reuben Sanderson, for example). It also covers a somewhat more extended period of time than the literary group, for the oldest documents date from Frederick Barbarossa and Pope Alexander IV on the Continent and Henry I in England, while the most recent belong to the present generation.

The sources of the items in this section are too varied for a summary within the limits of this article. Some of the groups of autographs were assembled by earlier collectors, e.g., the John Thane collection of handwritings of royal and illustrious personages of the British Isles, the documents of the popes gathered by the London bookseller J. Pearson, and the set of autographs of the signers of the Declaration of Independence purchased from Col. C. C. Jones. Other groups were brought together by Mr. Morgan himself, and among them are several of the most useful collections in the Library, especially the letters and documents of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church, arranged in 12 folio volumes and comprising some 2,000 manuscript items, and the 3 volumes of letters, documents, plans, and maps illustrating the siege of Yorktown by the American forces in 1781.

The Morgan autograph collection is chiefly one of smaller groups. We have no extensive archives of great families and only a few collections of the correspondence of individuals (those of Sir James Murray-Pultney, British commander of Revolutionary times, the Marquis de Pastoret, and the American diplomat Henry Wheaton). More characteristic of the documents are the several "rulers" series, made up of papers of all descriptions chosen to illustrate the reigns of each in a series of sovereigns. The most voluminous of these is the "Rulers of England," from Henry VI (though containing a few scattered documents of earlier date) to George VI. This set is particularly strong in documents of the Tudor and Stuart kings. Similar, though less extensive, are the sets of "rulers" of France, Spain, Germany, Russia, and Italy—the last being divided into "Sovereigns" and "Nobility," with a special group of Medici documents.

One cannot pass over this section without mention of the early American source material. Though the field of historical Americana is not one of the major specialties of the Library, we do have important manuscripts of the early Colonial and Revolutionary periods. The later phases of American history are less well documented, though a scholar will often find papers of significance in our miscellaneous collection of "Autographs, American."

A glance at the accessions in this section during the last two years will illustrate both the contents of the collection and the nature of recent additions. The manuscripts newly added during the last two years are headed by three large groups: (1) The Fairfax Murray collection of European autographs comprises just under 300 letters and docu-

ments, largely of English, French, and, especially, Italian origin, and extends from the early fifteenth to the early eighteenth century, with emphasis on the earlier period; (2) the "Bowerswell Papers"—archival material on the relations of John Ruskin with his wife, Effie Gray, and with Sir John Millais—consist of about 600 letters from the principals in that marital drama and persons closely associated with them; and (3) the correspondence of Charles Dickens with Miss (later Baroness) Burdett Coutts also contains over 600 letters, all but a few in the hand of Dickens himself. Other authors represented by new autograph manuscripts include Robert Burns, Isaac Casaubon, John Clare, Wilkie Collins, William Cowper, Emily Dickinson, Robert Fulton, W. S. Maugham, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and Walt Whitman.

#### PRINTED BOOKS

In building their collection of incunabula, the Morgans did not set out to assemble as many as possible of the forty thousand editions known to have issued from Europe's presses before the close of the fifteenth century. The following statement of policy governing this department, which appeared in the first five-year "Review," defines its character:

The Collection . . . was formed, and has been added to, with the utmost care, study and discrimination, and with a deliberate avoidance of inconsequential material. To the primary needs of scholars for examples of the first printing of Classical, Biblical and other Texts, and woodcut and metal engravings, has been added an insistence upon the finest obtainable copies in quality and perfection.

Adherence to those standards was apparent in the first large group of fifteenth-century books to be incorpo-



rated into the Library—the William Morris-Richard Bennett collection—and it has never been relaxed.

The principal steps in the gradual building of this collection have already been suggested in the general historical introduction to this paper. We think of the Bennett purchase as being the true beginning of this, as it was of the department of illuminated manuscripts; yet, though it brought well over 700 incunabula, they were by no means the first in the Morgan Library. With the Toovey purchase had come numerous examples of fifteenth-century books which could hardly be surpassed for bibliographical importance or for rarity, such as the first printing of Augustine's *De civitate Dei* (Subiaco: Sweynheym & Pannartz, 1467), and Nicolas Jensen's first book, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* of Cicero (Venice, 1470), of which, incidentally, the intervening half-century has brought but one other copy to the shelves of an American institution.

The Library's incunabula are known to students of the period through their publication in the Library's *Check List of Fifteenth Century Printing in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, compiled by Ada Thurston and C. F. Bühler (New York, 1939). The volumes added since that date have been listed, and some of them described, in the two last "Reviews" and the first "Report to the Fellows."

A discussion of the fifteenth-century printing in the Morgan Library should properly begin with the blockbooks. Of these earliest illustrated printed books, usually known by such arbitrary titles as *Apocalypse*, *Biblia pauperum*, *Ars moriendi*, etc., the collection has 20, 5 of which are second copies and 2 of which are single-sheet woodblock prints.

Anyone familiar with the rarity of these volumes will recognize this as a good showing anywhere in the world and one unsurpassed in America.

The cornerstone of the incunabula collection is, of course, the "42-line" or "Gutenberg" Bible, represented by 1 copy printed on vellum and richly illuminated by hand, 1 printed on paper, and a third copy, likewise on paper, of the Old Testament only. Far rarer and, indeed, one of the earliest dated pieces of printing known is the *Indulgence* of Pope Nicholas V, printed in 1455 by the press of the "36-line" Bible. Equally uncommon is the Fust and Schoeffer *Psalter* of 1459 on vellum, which is not only one of the rarest books in the world but one of the most beautiful ever to issue from any press. The strength of the Morgan holdings in the earliest Mainz printings is suggested by the fact that Dr. H. Lehmann-Haupt drew on this collection for fourteen of the nineteen plates with which he illustrated his recent biography of Mainz's second printer, Peter Schoeffer.

An effort has been made to build a collection equally strong in the productions of the first presses of all of the countries which, following the lead of Germany, played a part in the early spread of the art of printing. The Library, as can be seen from the *Check List*, possesses a high proportion of the books issued by the first presses of Italy (Subiaco, Rome, and Venice), France (Paris and Lyons), and the Low Countries (Utrecht).

Rather than enumerate title after title of the more unusual volumes in the collection, I have chosen certain subject fields in which its strength is considerable. Inasmuch as several of these fields extend well beyond the period of the fifteenth century, I prefer to comment

on each group as a whole, to avoid having to return to the same subject in discussions of later printed books.

The first of these groups is that of the Bible, a field which was the special enthusiasm of both Morgans, father and son. The breadth of coverage of the collection and the quality of the volumes which compose it were well demonstrated in a recent exhibition, entitled simply "The Bible." Though supplemented by manuscripts for the earlier centuries, the collection of printed books supplied the majority of items exhibited. The illustrated catalog which was published as a guide to the exhibition describes about 100 printed Bibles, ranging from the "Gutenberg" to Bibles printed in America toward the close of the eighteenth century, each of them selected to illustrate a step in the transmission of Holy Writ. Included were most of the notable "firsts"—the first Hebrew, the first Italian, the first German, the first French, etc.—and a remarkably complete series of English Bibles, culminating in the first edition of the King James version. Few of the milestones in the history of the dissemination of the Scriptures to the people of western Europe were missing from this display.

Closely related in subject is the large group of early printed books on the liturgy of the Roman Catholic church which supplement the medieval manuscript: missals, psalters, books of hours, and so on. The liturgy of the Church of England is still more completely covered, and the Morgan collection of the *Book of Common Prayer* is one of the finest and most extensive in the country.

The early printings of the ancient classics make up another noteworthy group. Like the Bibles and liturgies, they have their beginnings in the fif-

teenth century but also include fine editions of later date. All but a few of the *editiones principes* which came from the presses of the incunabula period are here, both the Greek and the Latin. The Library owns both the 1465 Ciceros, one of which must be the first printed classic. Hardly less worthy of notice are the publications of that most interesting of printers who experimented with the problems of reducing Greek to print, Laurentius de Alopa of Florence. The British Museum *Catalogue of Fifteenth-Century Books* attributes six Greek *editiones principes* to Laurentius de Alopa's press, and copies of all six are now in the Morgan Library—a boast which, we believe, no other American library can make.

One cannot progress far in the subject of first printings of the classics without encountering the name of Aldus Manutius. The excellence of the Morgan collection of early classics is due, in large measure, to its collection of Aldines. The core of that collection was the special Aldine library, which constituted roughly half the Toovey purchase. Toovey had acquired most of it *en bloc* from the library of the Earl of Gosford, who, in assembling his own collection, was able to draw heavily upon that of A. A. Renouard, the bibliographer of the Aldine Press. Thanks largely to the successful efforts of Lord Gosford, the Morgan roster of the books printed by Aldus Manutius the Elder is all but complete. Not only does it include his more ambitious and better-known productions, like the five-volume Aristotle, but also the slighter and far rarer ephemera, like the *Brevissima introductio ad litteras Graecas*. Indeed, the Morgan Aldines include a few volumes which are not represented in the larger collection of the British Museum.

While less attention has been paid to acquiring the commoner productions which poured from the press after the death of the elder Aldus, many of those titles are in the collection also, particularly those which were first printings of Greek or Latin texts.

Other, smaller collections of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century printing which are worthy of separate mention include those of travel, herbals, early science, historical chronicles, and the works of Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Savonarola, and the humanist Angelo Poliziano.

The collecting and study of England's first printer, William Caxton, forms a very special branch of English bibliography, for the volumes which came from his presses are probably more prized by Englishmen and Americans than any other books. Into this field, necessarily rather restricted because of the great rarity of those volumes, Pierpont Morgan entered early and with vigor. After acquiring 7 Caxtons from various sources, he suddenly rose to first place among American collectors by obtaining 32 others in one lot with the Bennett collection. With later additions, the Morgan Caxtons now total 46 separate titles (68, including duplicates), outdistancing all other collections, save only the British Museum and the John Rylands Library.

The primacy of the Morgan Caxtons is by no means a matter of numbers only, for the quality of the titles in the collection is as outstanding as its size. More than half the volumes are perfect (except for blank leaves in some cases)—a notable percentage in Caxtons. Moreover, they include many of the most important titles, from whatever point of view considered, e.g., the only known perfect copies of the first edition of the *Recuyell of the Historyes of*

*Troie* (1475) and of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* (1485), as well as a number of unique copies that are lacking even in the larger collection of the British Museum.

English printing of the earlier sixteenth century is also well represented in the Morgan Library, but the output of later presses less so. In *STC* books of all but the earliest period, the Morgan Library cannot compete with half-a-dozen other American libraries. Yet, even in this field, it owns more than a sprinkling of important titles, particularly in the writings of certain authors, Bacon and Bunyan among them.

Printed books of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have always been overshadowed in this library by the relatively greater attention paid to the earlier periods. Consequently, Morgan copies of first editions of English and American authors of more recent times have received less notice than they deserve. For certain of those authors the collection is remarkably complete, and there are, throughout, highly prized gems which more extensive collections frequently lack.

Noteworthy, too, are the first editions of French writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially Bossuet, Corneille, Fénelon, Le Sage, Molière, Racine, Rousseau, and Voltaire.

Among other subjects which scholars will find uncommonly well represented in the Morgan Library are medieval romances; Reformation literature; the history of Mary Queen of Scots; early illustrated books; English caricatures; costume and other color-plate books; gardening and botanical illustration.

Special attention is given to the collection of reference books to aid researchers in all the fields of the Library's specialization. As indicated

above, the most complete group is that covering paleography and manuscript illumination, but other departments with good supporting collections include early printing, autography, American and English literature and history, bookbinding, and general art history.

#### BOOKBINDINGS

Between the collections of purely bibliographic character and those of particular importance for the history of the fine arts stand the bookbindings. The earliest specimens in the Library are not, properly speaking, bindings at all but covers intended for attaching to a book already bound. The two earliest of the Morgan group of these jeweled and richly ornamented covers of heavy gold and silver now adorn the *Ashburnham Gospels* and are the chief surviving monuments of the Carolingian goldsmith's art.

The collection of Coptic bookbindings, the earliest of them from the sixth century, has already been mentioned in connection with the oriental manuscripts.

Some few examples of bookbinding practice of the medieval West have been preserved with the illuminated manuscripts: for example, the ivory plaques which adorned the covers of the Cologne Gospels, the contemporary oaken boards that still clothe the tenth-century Anhalt Gospels, and the stamped and gilded pink doeskin on MS 338.

With the Renaissance and the spread of printing, the bookbinder's art assumed a new significance, the first manifestations of which are to be seen in Germany and adjacent regions. In the Morgan collection are several fine specimens of these Gothic book coverings, the

*cuir-cisé*, blind-stamped, and panel-stamped techniques which preceded the introduction of gold-tooling.

The major types of the more elaborate bindings of subsequent centuries and the productions of all the major binders of Italy, France, and England from the early sixteenth to the close of the eighteenth century are well represented—bindings associated with the names of Grolier, Mahieu, Eve, Padeloup, and Derome in France and with Berthelet, Mearne, and Roger Payne in England, to name but a few of the better known.

Yet these famous names do not account for all the distinguished armorial bindings, a style which had its beginnings in all the countries of western Europe early in the sixteenth century and for a long time formed one of the most distinctive types of book-covering. In 1935 the Morgan collection was already rich enough to afford the material for an exhibition devoted exclusively to armorial binding. About 150 different specimens were placed on view, beginning with sixteenth-century rulers (Henry VIII and Elizabeth in England; Louis XII and Anne of Brittany in France; and Pope Clement VII) and continuing to include the cream of royalty, nobility, and "amateurs des livres" of western Europe. Since that time, the addition of bindings bearing the arms or symbols of Henri II, the Fuggers of Augsburg, Sir Francis Bacon and his mother, Lady Ann Bacon, and others has enriched the collections still further.

#### DRAWINGS AND PRINTS

The art collections of the Library comprehend the old master drawings, Rembrandt etchings and other prints,

as well as a selection of *objets d'art* and a few paintings. The latter are, for the most part, on permanent exhibition in the public rooms of the main building, of which they form the principal furnishings.

The collection of original drawings in the Morgan Library ranks among the foremost in this country, sharing honors with those in the Fogg Museum, the Metropolitan Museum, and the Rosenwald collection. Something of its significance is revealed in the fact that, as one of thirty-six lenders to the great drawing exhibition commemorating the Diamond Jubilee of the Philadelphia Museum in 1950, the Morgan Library contributed one-eighth of the drawings exhibited. The collection now numbers over 3,000 sheets, a figure small in terms of the vast European collections but substantial for this country. In point of time, it extends from the fourteenth century to the English illustrators of the nineteenth century. Masters of the Dutch, English, Flemish, French, German, Italian, and Spanish schools are represented.

The greater part of the master-drawings of the period from the Renaissance through the eighteenth century came from the collection brought together by the English painter and connoisseur Charles Fairfax Murray. Fairfax Murray records that he began the collection in Italy in the last quarter of the nineteenth century but that the bulk of the material accrued from the dispersal of various English drawing cabinets, such as the Palmerston, Aylesford, Warwick, Holford, and Robinson. The elder Morgan purchased the Fairfax Murray collection in 1910. The more important of the drawings are described in an illustrated four-volume catalog, *Collection*

*J. Pierpont Morgan: Drawings by the Old Masters, Formed by C. Fairfax Murray* (London, 1910-12 [Vol. I originally published by Fairfax Murray in 1905]).

Although, in general, the Library attempts to acquire only one or two examples of an individual artist's work, several of the masters are more prominently represented. The Dürer collection, for example, has been pre-eminent in this country since 1910, when Mr. Morgan acquired 4 famous drawings from the Von Lanna sale (including the "Adam and Eve," a study for the well-known engraving of 1504, and the portrait study of the Kneeling Donor for his painting "The Feast of the Rose Garlands") more or less simultaneously with the Fairfax Murray specimens of his draughtsmanship. The 30-odd pages of the sketchbook of Cesare da Sesto, a Leonardo disciple, form an unusual sixteenth-century item, and the drawings of Parmigianino comprise a sizable group from the same century. Among the seventeenth-century drawings, the series of nearly 20 studies by Claude Lorrain is the most extensive on this side of the Atlantic, and the Library is one of the few American institutions owning drawings by the other great French artist of the period, Nicolas Poussin. Its inventory of the drawings of the great Flemish trio, Rubens, Van Dyck, and Jordaens, is substantial (around 30 sheets divided more or less evenly among the three). The multitude of sketches from the pen of Rembrandt and his pupils fills several so-called cases. Watteau's beautiful chalk study, "Seated Woman," one of those engraved by Boucher, was an early acquisition of the elder Morgan; it is the best known of the Library's series



of the French painter's drawings, which K. T. Parker, in his monograph on Watteau drawings,<sup>5</sup> describes as the richest in America. Among the eighteenth-century Italian draughtsmen, the Library numbers about 120 drawings from the hand of the Tiepolos, father and sons, most of which formed one of the Algarotti-Cheney volumes. As the repository of the collection of the late Mrs. J. P. Morgan, the Library can claim the largest known single group of drawings (over 125) of Tiepolo's famous pupil, Piranesi. Students of English drawings turn to the Morgan Library for the best selection in this country of the drawings of Hogarth and Gainsborough and for a delightful run of Rowlandson's water colors. They also have the opportunity to compare two magnificent sets of the water-color illustrations of William Blake: the 21 beautiful designs for the Book of Job executed for Thomas Butts, which came to the Library after the sale of the Earl of Crewe in 1903, and the graceful series of 12 illustrations for Milton's *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. The latter, likewise from the Crewe collection and originally commissioned by Butts, was added by Mr. Adams late in 1949 as the first major acquisition under his directorship.

The Rembrandt etchings, admirable in quality of impression and rarity of state, form a collection of great distinction. Twenty-five years ago, Arthur M. Hind wrote of it as containing "a wonderful series of fine impressions which would compare with any but the four principal European collections." They came originally from two principal sources, the Theodore Irwin collection and that of George W. Vander-

bilt, but have been continuously augmented and, at present, number 491 prints. They include impressions of all but thirty of the separate subjects cataloged by Hind, and those are mainly minor early prints which exist in only a few impressions and are virtually unobtainable.

The mezzotints, at the moment somewhat out of fashion, are noteworthy as including examples of the earliest engravings in this medium, beginning with those from the hand of the inventor of mezzotint, Ludwig von Siegen.

#### POLICIES AND SERVICES

In establishing the policies of the Library, the trustees have been guided by a conception of its function in American cultural life as twofold: to preserve literary, historical, and artistic records of the past, in the best condition possible, for the inspiration and edification of future generations and to make them available to the present generation to the fullest extent consistent with their preservation. Through its exhibitions the Library lays before the eyes of visitors selections from its holdings in all fields; in its reading-room it offers its books and manuscripts for close study by scholars.

The policy of recent years has been to present two major exhibitions per year, usually drawn exclusively from Morgan materials but occasionally supplemented by loans from other owners. In addition, smaller exhibitions are arranged to mark anniversaries or commemorate events which the Library's material can elucidate. The subjects of the major exhibitions of the last ten years, in so far as not previously mentioned, are here given, not merely to illustrate the nature and variety of the exhibitions themselves but also to offer

<sup>5</sup> Karl Theodore Parker, *The Drawings of Antoine Watteau* (London, 1931).

a somewhat different cross-section of the collections: "The Animal Kingdom"; "Historic Voyages, Travels, and Maps, Exclusive of the Americas"; "English Caricatures"; "Fashions of the French Court in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century"; "Religious Symbolism in Illuminated Manuscripts"; "The Written Word, 2600 B.C. to the Invention of Printing"; "Sports and Pastimes from the Fourteenth through the Eighteenth Century"; "The First Christmas"; "Flowers of Ten Centuries"; "Mesopotamian Art in Cylinder Seals"; "The Letter . . . Illustrating the Practice of Letter-writing through 3,500 Years"; "Gilbert and Sullivan."

There persists in certain circles an unfortunate belief that the Pierpont Morgan Library extends a less hearty welcome to scholars than do some other libraries of rare books. This is not the case. One of the fundamental purposes of the Morgans in establishing the collections was the provision of materials for scholars which would enable them to extend the boundaries of human knowledge. The trustees and staff of the Library have never pursued an aggressive policy of seeking out or subsidizing scholars, however, believing it more important to continue building up its collections, and confident in the knowledge that material of value will sooner or later be called for.

GRADUATE THESES ACCEPTED BY LIBRARY SCHOOLS  
IN THE UNITED STATES, 1950-51—SUPPLEMENT

THE list of theses printed below was received too late for inclusion in the October, 1951, issue. The inclusion of these titles brings the total number of entries for 1950-51 to 268.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LIBRARY  
SERVICE, NEW YORK CITY

- ANNABLE, DOROTHY. *The Status of Secondary-School Librarians*, 1951.
- BOLEF, MRS. DORIS. *An Analysis and Evaluation of Subject-Heading Lists Used in Several Special Libraries in the New York City Area*, 1951.
- BRADLEY, JENNIE RUTH. *Books in California Missions*, 1950.
- BUDINGTON, WILLIAM S. *The Obsolescence of Engineering Books*, 1951.
- BULLOCK, PENELOPE L. *Book-reviewing in Negro Periodicals, 1946 and 1947*, 1951.
- BUMP, RUTH E. *Adequacy of Book Reviews for Selection of Current Adult Books for High-School Libraries*, 1951.
- COHEN, JOSEPH L. *Centralized Technical Processes Divisions in Libraries*, 1951.
- DAVIS, MRS. FLORENCE B. *The Status of Libraries in the Negro Accredited High Schools in Virginia*, 1951.
- DEANGELO, RACHAEL W. *Role of the Student Library Club in a Total High-School Program*, 1951.
- EBERT, MYRIL L. *The Rise and Development of the American Medical Periodical, 1797-1850*, 1951.
- ELDER, MARGARET E. *The Use by Readers of the Interunit Loan Service in the Los Angeles County Public Library System*, 1951.
- FARIES, ELIZABETH. *The Small Public Library as an Agent for Preserving Local History and Making It Available for Reference Use*, 1951.
- FITCH, VIOLA K. *What Becomes of Children's Librarians*, 1950.
- FRAREY, CARLYLE J. *Subject-Heading Revision by the Library of Congress, 1941-50*, 1951.
- GALLOWAY, M. LOUISE. *The Historical Development and Present Status of Public High-School Libraries in Kentucky, 1908-50*, 1951.
- GRANT, MARGARET E. *Classics Read and Enjoyed by Junior High School Boys and Girls*, 1951.
- GUSTAFSON, ALICE G. *The Status of Public Elementary-School Library Service in Selected Cities of Illinois*, 1951.
- HINKLEY, MARY E. *The Role of the College Library in the Preservation and Organization of the Archives of Its Own Institution*, 1951.
- HINTON, MARGARET O. *An Evaluation of College and University Library Handbooks for Students*, 1950.
- HOWARD, ANNA L. *An Evaluation of Hospital Library Service by Volunteers*, 1951.
- KEEN, MARGARET E. *Participation of the School Librarian in Local and District Library Associations*, 1951.
- MCCLUSKER, LAURETTA. *Development and Present Condition of Public School Libraries in Iowa*, 1951.
- MCGINNIS, DOROTHY A. *Use of the Public Library in Newark, N.J., by High-School Students*, 1951.
- MADDOX, TREAN. *School Library Supervisory Programs in City School Systems*, 1950.
- MAHAR, MARY HELEN. *Activities and Services of the School Library as Related to Modern Concepts of Its Educational Function*, 1950.
- MARCELLUS, MRS. EFFIE. *Treatment of the American Negro in Four Reference Sources Used by Young People*, 1951.
- MARCUS, MRS. JUDITH. *Attitude of Parents toward the Library of a Senior High School Attended by Their Children*, 1951.
- MARTIGNONI, MARGARET. *Qualifications and Performance of Children's Librarians in Public Libraries of the United States*, 1951.
- MORROW, ALMA I. *Publications of Land-Grant Institutions*, 1951.
- OELLRICH, GERTRUDE. *New Jersey State Author Headings: A Preliminary Study*, 1951.
- PEELER, ELIZABETH H. *Functions and Duties of Faculty Library Committees in Colleges*, 1951.

- PRITCHARD, JENNIE D. *The Practice of Simplified Cataloging in Large University and Reference Libraries*, 1951.
- SCHEIN, MRS. BEATRICE. *The Leisure-Time Activities and Interests of Newark Youth and Their Implication for the Newark Public Library*, 1951.
- STICKLE, NELLIE R. *Community Service Programs of Selected Liberal Arts College Libraries*, 1951.
- STRIPLING, ERMA M. *The Technical Organization of Film and Visual Materials in College and University Libraries*, 1951.
- STRAKA, MILDRED. *An Historical Review of the Cataloging Department of the Columbia University Libraries, 1883-1950*, 1951.
- THURLOW, MARTHA. *The Use of the Subject Catalogs in the Biology and Chemistry Departmental Libraries in a University*, 1951.
- WALSH, BERTRAND. *Current American Sources of Concise Information on the Properties, Prices, Distributors, and Trade Names of Chemicals*, 1951.
- WINTER, HELEN V. D. *Public Library Expenditures in Relation to Certain Cultural Indices*, 1951.

## THE COVER DESIGN

**J**OHANNES DE LEGNANO, the first brother of the famous firm of publishers to go into business, opened a shop in Milan in 1480. In his colophons he described himself as a printer, and he continued to do so until at least the end of the fifteenth century. In 1499 he went into partnership with Leonardus Pachel, a printer of Milan, and with Girardus de Tridino, a printer of Pavia. Johannes de Legnano himself, however—so bibliographical evidence indicates—was not a practicing printer. He was probably merely a partner who supplied capital and business direction to craftsmen in the printing trade. This situation was by no means uncommon in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. A large number of businessmen were thus associated with craftsmen, but historians today nevertheless count them among the printers.

Johannes de Legnano certainly was primarily a publisher. With his two brothers, Johannes Antonius and Johannes Jacobus, he conducted a large publishing and book-selling business in Milan. During the early part of the sixteenth century the printers of Milan were heavily engaged in manufacturing books for the firm. Leonardus and Johannes Angelus Scinzenzeler were printers closely associated with the brothers. Sometimes, also, the firm employed printers in other cities of northern Italy.

The enormous volume of the publications of the firm included almost every sort of book. But religion, canon law, and the classics—nearly all in Latin—were favorite subjects of the brothers. There is little doubt, to judge from the titles, that the firm aimed to supply an international market. It was able to publish expensive books, including sumptuous missals replete with woodcuts. Its books met with such

success that the brothers continued to publish for more than half a century, remaining in business until 1533 or later. A publishers' device of the brothers (it may have been a printer's mark of Johannes de Legnano also) is here reproduced. Against a forest scene an angel lowers a shield resembling a priest's chasuble. On it appears a cross-surmounted *IHS* within a double circle. Below this is a truncated triangle, the bottom of which is cut by two lines to form an *M*. Within the triangle is an *O*, which stands between an *I* and an *L*. Above the triangle a bar is joined to the circle by an upright line. On this line is laid a St. Andrew's cross.

The *M* in the device is the initial of "Milano"; *Io L* forms the abbreviation for "Johannes de Legnano"; the St. Andrew's cross is a common fertility or good-luck symbol.

The *IHS*—though popularly believed to represent the formula "Iesus Hominum Salvator"—is simply a contraction of the Greek form of "Jesus." The cross above the *H* had its origin in a line indicating abbreviation. The three letters standing thus together, however, became regarded anagogically as symbols

of the Persons of the Trinity. The symbol for the Second Person was hence marked with a cross, a practice met with in other printers' marks (cf. that of Paul Hurus, *Library Quarterly*, XIV [1944], 159). The circle inclosing the letters was then regarded as a symbol of the unity of the Trinity.

The angel in the device was part of the house sign of the brothers De Legnano.

EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY

FOLGER SHAKESPEARE  
LIBRARY





## THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

THEODORE C. BLEGEN (Ph.D., L.H.D., Litt.D.) is dean of the Graduate School and professor of history in the University of Minnesota. Born in Minneapolis in 1891, he received most of his undergraduate and graduate education at the University of Minnesota. Among the positions he has held in the past are those of superintendent of the Minnesota Historical Society, president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and, during World War II, director of the National Historical Service Board, which prepared materials for the Army's *G.I. Round-Table*. He was a Guggenheim Fellow in 1928-29.

Mr. Blegen is the author of many books, among them *Land Lies Open* (1949), *With Various Voices* (1949), *Grass Roots History* (1947), a two-volume monograph on Norwegian migration to America, a collection of immigrant ballads and songs, and a history of his own state of Minnesota.

GEORGE KENNETH BOYCE received his A.B. (1927) and M.A. (1928) degrees from Cornell University, his Ph.D. (1933) from Yale, and his A.B.L.S. (1938) from the University of Michigan. From 1933 to 1935 he was a fellow of the American Academy in Rome.

Prior to his appointment to his present post of curator of autograph manuscripts at the Pierpont Morgan Library in 1949, Mr. Boyce held various positions in the circulation and order departments of the University of Michigan Library, worked as an assistant in the Pierpont Morgan Library, was librarian of the American Academy in Rome, and served as staff intelligence officer with the U.S. Army Air Forces.

Among Mr. Boyce's numerous publications are *Corpus of the Lararia of Pompeii* (Rome, 1937) and a large number of articles, mostly on bibliographical subjects.

ERNEST C. COLWELL was born in Halstead, Pennsylvania, in 1901. He holds a Ph.B. (1923) from Emory University, a B.D. (1927) from the Candler School of Theology, a Ph.D. (1930) from the University of Chicago, and honorary degrees from Emory University, Colby College, and Harvard University.

Mr. Colwell began his career as instructor in

English literature and Bible at Emory University (1924-28). In 1930 he came to the University of Chicago, where he taught New Testament literature and rose to a succession of administrative positions: dean of the Divinity School (1939-45), dean of faculties (1943-45), vice-president (1944-45), and president (1945-51). At the present time, he is Distinguished Visiting Professor at Emory University and consultant to the Fund on the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Colwell is the author of *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel* (1931), *John Defends the Gospel* (1936), *The Study of the Bible* (1937), *The Four Gospels of Karahissar*, Vol. I (1936), *Elizabeth Day McCormick Apocalypse*, Vol. II (1939), and *An Approach to the Teaching of Jesus* (1947). He has edited a number of textbooks and contributed widely to religious journals.

RALPH E. ELLSWORTH: for biographical information see the *Library Quarterly*, XII (1942), 764; XIV (1944), 60; and XV (1945), 244. Mr. Ellsworth was recently appointed president of the Association of College and Reference Librarians for the year 1951-52 and has served as chairman of the A.L.A. 75th Anniversary Committee in 1951.

KEYES D. METCALF: for biographical information see the *Library Quarterly*, XII (1942), 765. Mr. Metcalf has been professor of bibliography at Harvard University since 1945. In 1942-43 he was president of the American Library Association.

EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY: for biographical information see the *Library Quarterly*, VII (1937), 435, and *Who's Who in America*. With this issue, Mr. Willoughby, chief bibliographer of the Folger Shakespeare Library, completes twenty years during which he has selected the cover designs for the *Library Quarterly* and supplied background information on them. Fifty of these designs were brought together in a book entitled *Fifty Printers' Marks*, published by the Book Arts Club of the University of California in 1947. Mr. Willoughby was recently made a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature.

## REVIEW ARTICLE

### THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SUBJECT CATALOG: AN EVALUATION

THE Library of Congress *Subject Catalog*<sup>1</sup> was undertaken, in response to popular and professional demand, as a complement to the Library of Congress *Author Catalog* (formerly *The Cumulative Catalog of Library of Congress Printed Cards*). It marks an important milestone not only in the bibliographical program of the Library of Congress but also in the development of subject bibliographical control of international scope. It lists under appropriate subject headings, regardless of country of origin, works published since January, 1945 (in the Roman, Greek, Hebrew, Gaelic, or Cyrillic alphabets), received and cataloged by the Library of Congress or for that library by other American libraries participating in the co-operative cataloging program.

The Library of Congress must be complimented on undertaking so valuable a service for libraries throughout the world, for the scholar, the student, and the general reader. Even to the reference worker or patron in a small-town library in Nevada or in an American information library in Bombay, who may wish to locate recent books on Greek church music or on weed control, it makes available a large section of the bibliographic resources of one of the great libraries of the world.

The *Subject Catalog* is an alphabetical catalog issued in three quarterlies and an annual cumulation. It assembles under the standard Library of Congress subject headings traced on the printed cards those works listed under authors, editors, translators, etc., in the *Author Catalog* for the corresponding period. It is produced by filing and photomechanical processes, with a minimum of editorial direction and revision. Only the main body of the entry

through the collation (including the first series note, if printed in the collation line) is reproduced, together with the Library of Congress and the Dewey Decimal class number, the LC card number, and the name of the library supplying copy (if a co-operative entry).

The decision to omit all notes and tracings in the *Subject Catalog* was made in the interest of economy in bulk and expense, and so must probably stand, although in many respects these omissions lessen the value of the catalog. Notes concerning the language of the text or the literary form of the work are certainly as important under subject as under author. Notes concerning the persons or organizations responsible for the editing or publication of the book are a vital clue to the subject value of the contribution. Notes concerning the scope of the work and the contents are more important under subject than under author. Bibliographical references indicate the character of the work as a documented study or an impressionistic survey. Statements that the work is based upon, supplements, or supersedes another work are likewise important under subject. Tracings often serve to reveal the scope or the special slant of the treatment. But a machine cannot make evaluative choices. The full entry might conceivably be reproduced under the first subject and the other entries be merely references to it. Practically, however, the only recourse seems to be to keep the user reminded that fuller information about the work is to be found in the *Author Catalog*. Perhaps a note to this effect could be inserted in the lower margin of each pair of pages.

It is easy to point out defects and inconsistencies in the *Subject Catalog*. But the production of the catalog by largely mechanical methods with a minimum of editorial supervision has made its publication financially feasible; and one should not expect the degree of discrimination and sense that would be taken for granted in a well-edited bibliography. That details of the format, layout, and organization of the catalog are receiving careful

<sup>1</sup> *The Library of Congress Subject Catalog: A Cumulative List of Works Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards*. Compiled and edited by the Catalog Maintenance Division, Library of Congress. Washington: Library of Congress, 1950. \$100.00 a year for three quarterly issues and an annual cumulation.

study by the editors is manifest in the changes that have been made or projected since its inception. These will contribute to clarity and ease of consultation and will, in some instances, also reduce the cost of production and make the catalog more nearly self-sustaining.<sup>2</sup> One early improvement was the expansion of nearly all abbreviations in subject subdivisions. No longer is the uninitiated user vexed with such ambiguous or enigmatic entries as "Church history—Period," "U.S.—Bound," "Public administration—Direct.," or "Gt. Brit.—Comm.," which occur in the first quarterly issue. In the April/June, 1951, issue the discontinuance of underscoring of subject headings results in greater legibility as well as a saving in expense. In issues after the first for 1951, terms following *see* and *see also* references are given in lower case with initial capitals instead of in solid capitals; they are easier to see and to grasp. In the 1951 annual, *see also* references will appear ahead of all entries under a subject, where they will serve to define its scope and to lead the user directly to the related or specific headings in which he might be interested. In the current issues, main headings are given only once and are omitted under subdivisions, which results in a clearer display of material under subjects. In the first 1951 quarterly this change caused an absence of captions which would give alphabetical orientation at the head of each page. The resulting difficulties are apparent in the case of voluminous subjects, such as "Aeronautics" or "English language." It is good to see that this defect, has been corrected in the April/June issue, the main headings being repeated at the top of the first column of each page. The Library of Congress is experimenting with typewriter composing machines which will afford a wider variety of type faces and point sizes in the headings and cross-references and make possible greater clarity and legibility. The printed subject captions in the new annual volume of the *British National Bibliography* are certainly preferable to the typed headings in the Library of Congress *Subject Catalog*.

A feature lacking in the *Subject Catalog*

<sup>2</sup> For an account of the "one-card" production system adopted in 1951 for the author and subject catalogs, and of the typographic changes in the 1951 *Subject Catalog*, see the articles by C. D. Gull in the *Library of Congress Information Bulletin*, X (April 2, 1951), 15-16.

which the editors should undertake to provide is an introductory section explaining for what purposes and how to use the catalog. This should include a detailed statement of the scope and limitations of the coverage and a clear exposition setting forth the general design of the subject-heading system, including the general principles of entry and subdivision and the organization by means of *see* and *see also* references. This might be included only in the annual volumes. A similar introduction is needed also in the *Author Catalog*. The "Preface" and "Hints for Tracing Information" in the *British National Bibliography* are models of conciseness and clarity. The time of reference librarians is at a premium, and much will be saved if a minimum of professional guidance is required in using the catalog.

Comprehensive subject catalogs of the collections of great libraries are perhaps the closest possible approach to universal subject bibliographies. The British Museum *Subject Index of Modern Works* is the most nearly comparable to the *Subject Catalog*, but its time range is much broader, it does not attempt any such current coverage, and it is highly selective. It tends to use less specific subject entries and to group related materials under broader headings. More nearly comparable in currency of coverage is the *Sveriges Offentliga Bibliotek: Accessions-Katalog*, an annual classified list of foreign publications received in over forty Swedish libraries (Swedish publications are assumed to be listed adequately in the *Årskatalog*). It covers a longer time period, and it includes important acquisitions of older works. Its clear, systematic organization with author and topical index is admirable, displaying the contributions to the various subject fields in close logical order, in marked contrast to the alphabetical chaos of American dictionary catalogs. The ease with which it may be consulted even by one not familiar with the Swedish language is surprising. The usefulness of the LC *Subject Catalog* will always be largely limited to the English-speaking world. The new *British National Bibliography*, of which the first annual volume has recently appeared, is, of course, confined to British publications and is not comparable in coverage. It is classified according to the Decimal Classification, with author and topical indexes. In format and typography it is superior to the *Subject Catalog*. Whether or not

one likes the Decimal Classification, one cannot fail to appreciate the benefits to be gained by systematic arrangement. Looking under "British history," for example, one finds the works on local history displayed in one section and conveniently grouped by county, city, town, and parish—showing at a quick glance what has been published in the field. In the LC catalog one would have to assemble the material by blindly searching under every British place name in the alphabetical file. The French Bibliothèque Nationale program, as yet largely unrealized, follows a still different plan—a general alphabetic subject catalog and a series of systematic catalogs, each confined to a broad subject field.<sup>3</sup> Such a program has value chiefly for retrospective bibliography, but it makes sense if supplemented by a similarly organized system of current subject documentation services.

In many countries the national or trade bibliographies, subject and author, are integrated with copyright deposit catalogs or accessions catalogs of the national, and perhaps also other, libraries. The new Canadian national bibliography, *Canadiana*, is part of a well-planned national bibliographical program. The LC *Subject Catalog* fits into no such well-conceived national plan. Until we have such a plan, we shall not know whether it is the type of general subject catalog which would best have served our needs. The fact that it forms an obvious counterpart of the *Author Catalog* and that it can be produced relatively cheaply by similar means perhaps led American librarians to suggest it, with insufficient consideration of its place in an ideal bibliographic structure. It is another bibliography, and a good and useful one; but its existence hardly remedies the chaotic state of American documentation. In many respects it duplicates what is as well or perhaps even better done, for example, in the *Cumulative Book Index*, in the various commercially or privately produced subject indexes, in the H. W. Wilson Company's *Fiction Catalog* and *Children's Catalog*, or in the *Catalog of Copyright Entries*. For English publications it duplicates the work of the *British National Bibliography*. In currency it is less satisfactory than many of these. In

coverage it is usually less dependable. In potential scope and coverage, however, it is broader than any or all combined.

Probably because its special function in American and international documentation is not clearly conceived and because its scope and coverage are largely defined and its promptness determined by the conditions of its production (the acquisition of the books by the Library of Congress or the co-operating libraries, their cataloging, and the printing of cards for them) rather than by the demands of its use, the new *Subject Catalog* received only passing notice in the *UNESCO/Library of Congress Bibliographical Survey*, at the Conference on Bibliographical Organization at the University of Chicago in August, 1950, and at the UNESCO Meeting on Improvement of Bibliographical Services in Paris in December, 1950. It was mentioned only once in the "United States Report on National and International Bibliographic Problems," prepared for the Paris conference.

From an international point of view, an alphabetical catalog is, of course, the least desirable type of subject bibliography. It is virtually untranslatable without practically duplicating the original production cost, for it must be entirely rearranged when the terms of entry are translated, and the translated terms are rarely exactly equivalent in meaning, so that the possibility of inaccuracy or error is very high unless the books are re-examined. It can be used effectively only by those possessing a good command of its language. Not so the classified *British National Bibliography*, which a Norwegian could use readily, or the *Bibliographie de Belgique*, which at very little increase in cost can be produced for the use of both French and Flemish readers by the simple device of giving in the two languages the caption headings interpreting the Decimal Classification numbers.

It would be interesting to know how many librarians, if any, thought of suggesting the production of a classified catalog based on the Library of Congress classification instead of a dictionary catalog. Probably very few; for, in spite of the current interest in semantic problems, the devotion of American libraries to the chaos of the alphabet is deep and well grounded in tradition and practice. A classed catalog would have been more expensive to produce, for it would involve the special reclassification of analytics and co-operative

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Léopold Delisle's "Introduction" in *Catalogue générale des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, I (Paris, 1897), xx-xxviii; and E. G. Ledos' *Histoire des catalogues des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1936).

entries and the making of added entries for the subjects treated in a book in addition to the one for which it was classified. The LC classification is perhaps so minute and involved and provides so many alternate classifications for the same material that it would not result in a readily usable and consistent systematic catalog.<sup>4</sup>

A systematic catalog on a clear and simple plan, however, would have many uses for which the dictionary *Subject Catalog* is very ill adapted. One can use the latter for quickly locating current material on specific topics, provided he can determine the subject entries used for those topics. But one can use it only with great difficulty for keeping up with current publications in a broader field, such as Japanese industry, paleontology, or Hellenistic culture. Its usefulness for book selection is practically nil. A classified bibliography could be issued in sections, which could be made available separately to those interested in special fields. The use of the *Subject Catalog* by subject specialists and scholars will probably be slight. To locate his material in the *Subject Catalog*, the African ethnologist would have to have at hand a complete list of African tribal and place names (in all their variant forms) plus a list of all ethnological subjects which might be subdivided by those place names or modified by the ethnic adjectives; then he would have to seek each of these possible entries in its alphabetical place, with no assurance of finding anything there. The presense of systematic arrangement inherent in the texture of *see* and *see also* references from general to specific subjects, and from co-ordinate related subjects to each other, is so tenuous and vague in conception and so tedious in use that some catalogers have even suggested the elimination of the *see also* references. It is the intricacy and inconvenience of the subject-heading system, rather than the adequacy of existing subject bibliographies, which explain the neglect of the dictionary card catalog by the scholar. It may list books which he does not know about; but he has not the time to make the search for them. Except for securing bibliographical data concerning known works, he has likewise failed to use the American na-

tional trade bibliographies, which are organized (or disorganized) in the same way. The general reader may find the *Subject Catalog* useful for specific purposes and easier to consult than the card catalog. But he would often be better served by a selective list, and he would rarely be able to find or use the foreign works included.

Some librarians have proposed the use of the *Subject Catalog* as a substitute for subject entries in their card catalogs for current works. This would appear as an obvious economy, though the card catalog is designed to cover a particular collection of locally available works; and, even with the present development of interlibrary loan and microphotography, the patron could object that he wants a list of works which he can readily find and use where he is. Promptness of coverage would be essential if the *Subject Catalog* were to be used for such purposes. This would be especially necessary for scientific works and those relating to current political and social developments. With the co-operation of publishers and with adequate financial support, it should be possible to speed up the cataloging process so that current American books would appear in the catalog within two to six months after publication. This would not be sufficiently prompt for many libraries. The lag for foreign books, especially in the humanities, ancient history, and religion, is closer to two to four years.

In the matter of scope, the *Subject Catalog* may be considered really comprehensive only for American printed copyright books and for United States printed documents. Its coverage of foreign books is selective or fortuitous and depends upon the acquisition policies of the Library of Congress and, to a lesser extent, upon those of the libraries supplying copy in co-operative cataloging. It must also be pointed out that its coverage, and certainly the promptness of its listings, depend upon the priority policies prevailing in the Processing Department of the Library of Congress. Works in fields with a high priority, such as American politics, economics, and history, international relations, technology, and certain sciences receive relatively prompt cataloging, while works on philology, philosophy, theology, medieval history, or musicology, which have a low priority, may be cataloged very tardily. Perhaps many of these works will never ap-

<sup>4</sup> The "New Series" of the *Bibliotheca Celtica*, issued by the National Library of Wales beginning in 1939, is a general subject catalog arranged according to the Library of Congress system.



pear, if not cataloged within five years of their publication.<sup>5</sup> Medicine is very inadequately covered because of the near-breakdown of cataloging relations with the Army Medical Library.

If the Farmington Plan fulfils the hopes of its advocates, it may result in more adequate coverage of foreign publications in the *Subject Catalog*, for, ideally, it proposes that every important publication from each country included in the plan be available in some American library and that an LC card be printed for it. Actually, the standards have not been agreed upon, the selection has not been uniformly good, and some of the libraries are inadequately equipped to supply acceptable copy or have declined to catalog for the Library of Congress any publications which they considered minor. Another factor which may improve the coverage of foreign books is that foreign publishers, recognizing the publicity value of listings in the LC catalogs, may forward complimentary copies of their publications with a view to their inclusion in the catalogs.

The best way, however, of assuring more complete coverage is by the fuller development of either centralized or co-operative cataloging. Since an appreciable expansion of centralized cataloging at the Library of Congress would require greatly increased appropriations for its Processing Department (which likely will not be forthcoming, though they could surely be justified in the national interest), more co-operative cataloging seems to be the best immediate solution.<sup>6</sup> Libraries could be persuaded to supply more copy for co-operative cataloging if the national program could be so expanded that they could be assured of the availability of LC cards for a much larger proportion of their current acquisitions, particularly for foreign works and for others difficult to catalog descriptively or to analyze by subject. Care would need to be exercised in administering the program to see that the work was distributed in such a way that a library would supply copy only for the

books which its cataloging staff has sufficient subject competence and linguistic equipment to handle economically and accurately.

Other proposals for enlarging the *Subject Catalog* include incorporating the subject entries traced on cards currently received by the LC Union Catalog and the subject cataloging of deferred materials in the Library of Congress on which only provisional author entries have been established. But it is at least as important to broaden the coverage of the *Author Catalog* as that of the *Subject Catalog*. The task of documentation is to make the materials in American libraries available both by author and by subject; and it can be accomplished economically and satisfactorily only if it is undertaken as a whole and on a national basis.

Within the limits of its coverage, the value of the *Subject Catalog* for documentation purposes depends upon the adequacy of the subject-heading system and upon the accuracy with which the headings are assigned. If a subject cataloger misses the essential point of a book because of his lack of background or his unawareness of current developments in its subject field, or because of his unsatisfactory acquaintance with its language, or because the pressure to meet production demands prevents him from examining the work sufficiently to determine exactly the subjects to which it makes significant contribution, then

<sup>6</sup> The Association of College and Reference Libraries Committee on Implementing Library of Congress Bibliographical Projects is considering ways in which the *Subject Catalog* can be made more inclusive in its coverage of materials available in American libraries. In a memorandum to the Librarian of Congress dated May 11, 1951, by F. H. Wagman, director, Processing Department, Library of Congress, which was made available to members of the committee, it was suggested that a scheme might be developed for centralized subject cataloging at the Library of Congress in which key libraries would co-operate by providing cataloging copy with subject headings, both for books in their collections not in the Library of Congress and for books in the Library of Congress the cataloging of which has been deferred. Under such a plan, which would make LC cards available for a much larger proportion of current works, a vast amount of duplicate effort and expense would be avoided, and the original cataloging done by each of the co-operating libraries would be largely limited to its share in the national undertaking.

<sup>5</sup> Since the catalog was originally limited to publications of 1945 and after, one may assume that this date will be periodically revised, so that each annual volume will cover publications of the preceding five years. A book received by the Library of Congress three or more years after publication and not cataloged for two years after its acquisition would thus be excluded.

that book will be lost to the student who depends upon the *Subject Catalog* to locate his material. The current speed-up in the Processing Department of the Library of Congress, necessary as it is and from many points of view commendable, must inevitably affect the quality of the subject cataloging. In the attempt to keep pace with greatly increased current acquisitions and to reduce the chaos of accumulated arrears despite limited financial resources and staff, some sacrifice in accuracy and thoroughness must be made, in order to achieve a minimum of bibliographical control over the essential part of the book collection. Critics from without should bear in mind the formidable task faced by the LC Processing Department and should sympathize with the trend toward greater efficiency. The *Subject Catalog* would be small indeed if absolute accuracy and consistency were required in every detail. Catalogers in the provinces, however, who are also required to make shortcuts, have pointed out that the numerous inaccuracies in subject cataloging and classification make it more essential than previously to re-examine the books and revise the subject tracings and classifications printed on LC cards, if the standards and usefulness of their catalogs are to be maintained. Anyone working regularly with the cards finds all too often that the book has been very superficially examined and that the title (often dictated by the publisher and not the author) has been almost the sole basis for assigning the subject headings. The inadequacies of *Schlagwort* catalogs result from such dependence upon titles. An accumulation of inadequate and inaccurate subject-heading assignments for individual works will certainly jeopardize the dependability of the *Subject Catalog* as a bibliographic instrument.<sup>7</sup>

If the *Subject Catalog* is continued in its present form, it will attain its highest usefulness only if the subject-heading system upon which it is based is constantly criticized and improved. The subject headings must be carefully selected, continually revised to keep them abreast of current usage and responsive to contemporary needs in all fields, clearly defined through adequate explanatory notes, and logically organized by sufficient but not overly elaborated *see* and *see also* references. The LC subject-heading list has been notably improved in recent years, but it still has many shortcomings. Changes in card catalogs are expen-

sive, and, naturally, the tendency is toward conservatism. It is unfortunate that the *Subject Catalog*, itself not tied to past practice, must, because of the manner of its production, perpetuate the errors and misjudgments of the past and reproduce the obsolescent headings and the inadequate or overly minute subdivisions of its parent card catalog.

If the *Subject Catalog* is to provide good coverage of current materials, it is essential that new headings for new ideas and developments be adopted promptly. The lag of two to ten years in admitting a new term to the list, which has been usual in the past, would mean that many of the most important works on the subject would never appear under it in the *Subject Catalog*. There is as yet no Library of Congress title catalog, nor is one really needed. The practice of using titles or catchword titles as crutches must be discontinued. They are very poor substitutes for needed subjects, especially in a catalog including foreign publications. They delude the user of the catalog into thinking that he has found his material before he has even located the proper subject entry for it; and they interfere with the cross-reference system. Terms for new discoveries, trends, and ideas are admittedly unstable, and the headings adopted first may later have to be changed. New headings might be admitted on a provisional basis; but at least tentative headings should be established as soon as the need for them is recognized. Since new developments and concepts normally receive notice in contributions to learned journals some time before books are written about them, the established indexes in special subject fields are the best sources for new terms

<sup>7</sup> Examples are odious; but the subjects assigned to Emile Mâle's *La fin du paganisme en Gaul* ("1. France—Church history—Early period. 2. Basilicas.") seem to miss the point of the work, a fairly comprehensive treatment of religious art in France in the early Middle Ages against its cultural background, complementing the author's similar works on later periods. The classifier followed the subject cataloger and classed the work in BR according to the first subject. The chances are good that the person to whom the book would be of greatest interest would fail to find it in the *Subject Catalog* or in the card catalogs of the libraries using LC cards as printed. An example of a patently absurd subject assignment is that for a recent German collection of extracts from Herodotus: "1. History, Ancient—Addresses, essays, lectures."

to be adopted as subject headings. The terms might require definition or modification if taken out of their context and incorporated in a general bibliography. The adequacy of LC headings in special disciplines could be tested and improved by comparing them with the terms of entry used in the good documentation services.

The original decision to omit subdivisions in the quarterlies if only a few entries appeared under the subject has been revised because of the editorial expense, and subdivisions are included in the 1951 quarterlies to agree with the tracings.<sup>8</sup> That subdivisions are an obstacle to the searcher if only a few entries appear is, in the opinion of the present writer, a misconception. The subdivisions often give a clearer and more precise indication of the scope and nature of the work than the title; and, in the absence of notes in the *Subject Catalog*, they are more essential than they are on the cards. One looking for eighteenth-century French literature will locate his titles more quickly if the period is brought out in the headings. The *Subject Catalog*, in fact, in which the user can see the grouping of material under a subject at a glance, as he cannot in a card catalog, points up the need for fuller subdivision under many subjects and for a more balanced policy. Subdivisions under some subjects, such as theology and languages, are excessively minute, while further subdivision is badly needed under others, such as the earlier periods in the histories of China, Egypt, the Jews, and the Mohammedan Empire. The headings for certain important national literatures have as yet no period subdivisions. There is no precise subject heading for a history of political thought in the Middle Ages or in the sixteenth century, or for a study of the linguistic geography of Switzerland. In order to assist the users of the *Subject Catalog* or of the card catalogs of libraries and to avoid expensive revision, subdivisions (at least those showing chronological or local limitation) should be planned in advance, wherever appropriate, and be used from the start.

Recent progress in improving the system of references and in eliminating obsolescent and artificial "catalogers'" headings in favor of terms in general use is commendable. We may now use "Child welfare" instead of "Children—

Protection." But a French-language reader must still be exhibited (or concealed) under "French language—Chrestomathies and readers," and a work on the duty of civil obedience appears under "Government, Resistance to." Editions of and works about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are still entered in the 1951 issues of the *Subject Catalog* under "Civil rights," without reference from "Human rights." Books on academic freedom must be listed under "Teaching, Freedom of." Works on the Bollingen Prize are entered under "U.S. Library of Congress. Bollingen Prize in Poetry," without reference from "Bollingen Prize." In the absence of title entries, the average reader will probably fail to locate the material. These are, of course, criticisms of the subject-heading system rather than of the *Subject Catalog* itself; but they are certainly not irrelevant in evaluating the usefulness of the catalog. Only if these shortcomings are remedied can the potentialities of the *Subject Catalog* be realized.

Inconsistencies in subject entries resulting from errors in tracings or from revisions in subject headings during the period covered by an issue could be eliminated only at considerable cost. Two titles are listed in the 1950 annual under "Dialectical materialism," which takes the place of "Dialectic (Economics)," appearing in the January-June, 1951, supplement to the LC *Subject Headings*. The other books on the subject, including M. C. Cornforth's *Dialectical Materialism*, are found under the old heading, "Dialectic (Economics)," with no connecting references or explanation. "Iran" was substituted for "Persia" for subjects as well as official entries during 1949. Entries are given under both forms in the first quarterly for 1950, without connecting references; and in the first 1951 issue entry is made under "Iran" only, without reference from "Persia." A *see* reference is made in the 1950 annual. As successive cumulations appear and the catalog is used for retrospective searching, it would be useful if, when a subject is revised in form or a new subject is introduced, an explanatory statement were made giving the date of the change and a note as to the heading or headings formerly used for the same material. The old entries in the past cumulations cannot be revised as they could be in a card catalog. Inconsistencies in the use of headings and subdivisions (often noted on co-

<sup>8</sup> Library of Congress *Information Bulletin*, X (April 2, 1951), 16.

operative cataloging cards, for practices vary in different libraries) become more apparent in a book catalog than in a card file. Works on Christian life are subdivided by denomination; but in the 1950 annual certain works obviously by Catholics, Anglicans, etc., are listed without subdivision.

The defects due to the absence of minute editorial supervision are most striking in the references. When a heading is used in an issue, only those *see* references (and in the annual volumes likewise those *see also* references) which are traced in the subject-heading list are inserted and reproduced. Hence a reference is automatically made from "Lunatic asylums" to "Insane—Hospitals," though any 1951 American reader who looked under "Lunatic asylums" should probably be in one. A reference from "Winding up of companies" to "Liquidation" seems of dubious need; but the user is spared a reference from "Companies, Winding up of." He would find no reference if he looked under "Companies—Liquidation" or "Partnerships—Liquidation."

General statements explaining the use and scope of the headings are all too few. Many references need revision. Under "Dialects," for example, reference is made to "Franco-Provençal dialects," to "Italic languages and dialects," and to "Grammar, Comparative and general" (but not to "Language and languages," where most of the general works are listed). There is no reference to the subdivision "Dialects" under names of languages and groups of languages, where the bulk of dialect studies will appear. A work on cycles of culture is given under "Periodicity." There is no reference from "Cycles" to "Periodicity." References from "Culture cycles" and from "Cycles of culture" to "Periodicity" and to "History (or Civilization)—Philosophy" would be useful.

The omission of *see also* references from the quarterly issues (for reasons of economy) may mean that any clue to the form of entry used is lacking. For the system is a whole, and the *see also* references are as essential in setting forth the terms under which material is listed as the *see* references, and they are more important in clarifying the general plan of the headings. Reference is made in a quarterly issue from "Tools, Agricultural" to "Agricultural machinery," since it is a *see* reference. But none is made from "Tools—Carpentry" to "Carpentry—Tools," because this is taken care

of by a *see also* reference from "Tools." In the first 1951 quarterly there are entries under "Numismatics, Arabic" and "Numismatics, Greek." Reference is made from Arabic numismatics but not from Greek numismatics. A book on Syrian coins is under "Numismatics—Syria"; but the person who looks under "Syrian coins" or "Syrian numismatics" will find neither entry of reference. The inclusion of the *see also* references and of the explanatory notes under "Coins" and "Numismatics" would help him to grasp the distinctions and find the titles which he wants.

Finding local material under general subjects, or special subjects under geographic or national headings, will always be difficult in a dictionary catalog. The user needs to have mastered the logic of the system in order to find his material, or he must be directed to use the various guides which list subdivisions used under local headings and subjects divided by geographic or ethnic adjectives or by place names. There has been no attempt in the *Subject Catalog* to make references from geographic subdivisions under subjects which are divided by place. A work taking the entry "Capital levy—Germany" will not be found under "Germany"; there will be no reference from "Germany—Capital levy." One looking under "Russia" will miss the book entered under "Serfdom—Russia." The student of intellectual history searching under "Civilization, Greek," but he will not be directed to those under "Egypt—Civilization."

References from variant forms of geographical, corporate, and personal names are often inadequate. There is no reference in the 1951 annual from "U.S.S.R." to "Russia" or from "Eire" to "Ireland"; there is no explanatory statement connecting "Israel" and "Palestine" or "India" and "Pakistan." Corporate name references should perhaps not be expected in the *Subject Catalog* if they are given in the *Author Catalog* for the same period. But a reference from "Library of Congress" to "U.S. Library of Congress" would not be amiss. Personal name references are normally included. One is made from "Coronado, Francisco" to "Vasquez de Coronado, Francisco." But there is none from "Virgil" to "Vergilius Maro, Publius." Fourteen entries appear in the 1950 annual under "Colombo, Cristoforo"; but the person who naïvely looked under "Columbus" would not be referred to them.



A special feature of the annual cumulations is the inclusion of form headings for literary works. Subjects are also given for certain other works, such as general periodicals and collections, administrative reports, and autobiographies, for which no subjects are normally printed on the cards. The subjects are specially assigned by the editors in consultation with the Subject Cataloging Division. A great deal of effort and expense has apparently gone into this project; but, in the opinion of the present writer, its purpose is not clear, and the plan is poorly conceived and not well executed. The logic seems to lie in the dogma that for every author entry there should be one or more subject entries.<sup>9</sup> The project results in a vast amount of duplication of entries; and the inconsistencies in the listings are hard to explain. It disregards the truism that for certain types of works the obvious approach is by author only. Listings of literary works had better be left to the appropriate literary bibliographies and indexes. Most readers will naturally look in the *Author Catalog* for the Boswell papers or for Franklin's autobiography.

Granting, for the moment, that these special listings really are sufficiently useful to justify the expense, their exploitation is hampered by the lack of any explanatory statement and any list of the special subject and form headings used. Only the compilers know about them; the reference librarian in a local library will come upon them by chance or will have to read through the catalog to discover what headings are used; and even then he will not know what to expect under each heading.

The entry "Collections of monographs, essays, etc." is used in the 1950 annual for miscellaneous collections of the most divergent types, all of which classify in AC or AS, except the publications of the Indiana University Observatory, which, strangely, do not appear under "Astronomy." Included are collections of essays by individual authors (which would be more appropriate under "American essays" or "Swedish essays") and also a small number of academy and institute publications, as well as jubilee publications or *Festschriften*. A *see also* reference is made from "Essays," but no reference is made from "Jubilee publications," "Festschriften," or "Academies—Publications."

<sup>9</sup> "Each entry is assigned at least one subject heading" (Library of Congress Catalog Maintenance Division, *Manual* [1950], p. 21).

There is no statement of the scope of the heading, and no reference leads the user to the subdivisions "Collections" and "Collected works" under subjects, where the great bulk of such collections will be found. The list is slightly over two columns in length, and one suspects that it is far from complete. Twelve periodicals classing in AP were listed in the first 1950 quarterly under "Periodicals—Individual titles." This heading disappears in later issues in favor of "American [French, etc.] periodicals (General)." The lists are very short, perhaps because they are incomplete, perhaps because LC is slow in printing cards for serials. The effort which goes into these special listings in the "Subject Catalog" could better be devoted to the much more valuable list published by the Library of Congress, *Serial Titles Newly Received*, which gives all titles promptly, whether or not a card is printed.

The form headings for belles-lettres and for translations unfortunately do not show careful planning and development. The editors are apparently meeting with difficulties and experimenting with various methods. An appeal has been issued to libraries supplying co-operative copy for cards to include notes concerning literary form when this is not apparent from the title. Such obvious errors as the listing of Madeleine Sabine's *La cage aux ombres* under "English fiction" or of an edition in the original German of Hoffmann-Donner's *Struwwelpeter* under "Children's literature, English" may be passed over. But the confusion which results from the use of "Fiction in English" for all works which the Library of Congress classes in PZ and of "English fiction" or "American fiction" for those which it classes in PR and PS can hardly be condoned. *See also* references connect the headings; but no explanation of the distinction is given. *Moby Dick* is under "Fiction in English"; *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is under "American fiction." A volume of Henry James's collected short stories one finds under "American fiction," not under "Short stories, American," though the latter heading is used for collections by other authors. Henrietta Macdonald's *Children of the Wind* is under "Short stories, Australian." It is not under "Fiction in English" or "English fiction."

Plays are entered under one of three possible headings—"English [French, etc.] drama," "English drama (Comedy)," and



"English drama (Tragedy)." The latter groups are separated from the first by various other subdivisions, and no reference is made. The average user will probably not think of looking under the other headings if he finds the list under "English drama." Works listed without distinction as to type either are melodramas, or they are plays unclassifiable because they are not well known and their titles furnish no clue to their classification. Surely, the compilers cannot be expected to read the plays to discover the type. The question is whether a single form heading would not be more useful and less expensive. Poetry is not so minutely classified—narrative and lyric poetry are given in the same list. Various other modes of entry might have been chosen with equal justification. Why should not the form entries be made under the period subdivisions, so that Frost's poems would appear under "American poetry—20th century"?

"English literature" is used as a form heading for a variety of works not readily classifiable. The list, about a page in length, includes selected works of Byron, Arnold, and Aphra Behn, as well as a juvenile version of *Pilgrim's Progress* (which does not appear under "Children's literature, English"). Washington Irving's *Selected Prose* appears under "American literature," not under "American prose literature."

The most elaborate display of form headings is for translations. Here the editors feel obliged to follow the LC practice of duplicate entry under the two literatures—e.g., "French literature—Translations into English" and "English literature—Translations from French." The usefulness of the last heading seems extremely limited. Even if it is to be used for collections and criticism, an explanatory reference could be made stating that English translations of the works of individual French authors are listed only under "French literature—Translations into English." The reference would take a line or two of type, while the duplicate entries occupy many pages. For a bilingual author, quadruplicate entries are made. Calvin's *The Duty of Christ and Other Sermons* has four form headings, all on the same page: "Sermons, French—Translations into English"; "Sermons, English—Translations from French"; "Sermons, Latin—Translations into English"; and "Sermons, English—Translations from Latin." Yet it is hardly conceivable that anyone wanting to read Calvin's

sermons would look anywhere except in the *Author Catalog* under "Calvin." Complications also arise in the translation entries from the use of "Fiction in English," especially because the use of "American fiction—Translations from French" would require the determination of the nationality of the translator. The subdivision "Translations from French" [etc.] is not used under "American drama" [fiction, poetry, etc.], but it is used under the headings for English literature, including "English fiction." But for works classing in PZ, the entry "Fiction in English—Translations from French" is used. The user who finds one group of entries will almost surely fail to look under the other, and he will find the distinction incomprehensible.

For the literature of a country which shares its language with other countries one could multiply translation entries almost indefinitely. A play in German by an Austrian author translated into English could conceivably appear under "Austrian drama (German)—Translations into English"; "German literature—Austrian authors—Translations into English"; "English drama—Translations from German." No examples of this were found in the 1950 annual; probably the nationality of such authors would not be brought out in the translation entries.

The lists of translations would be more useful if the translated works of individual authors were arranged by original titles rather than by translated titles. Since notes are omitted, the statement giving the original title is not even reproduced, nor is the name of the translator given if it does not appear in the body of the entry.

The array of translation entries might provide significant data for the study of intercultural relations, if one could be sure that the number of translations listed really represented the total production rather than merely the items acquired or, rather, the items cataloged by the Library of Congress, plus a few items in other American libraries. The impressive number of Slavic translations in the 1950 annual volume are probably there because of the effort to speed up the cataloging of arrears and current acquisitions in this field.

There is a bibliography of translations which attempts to list the total production of translations at their source in each country—the *Index Translationum*, which has resumed publication under the auspices of UNESCO. It

presents its data in well-organized form, is well indexed, and should be the reference work in the field. The translation entries for individual works in the *Subject Catalog* will tend more and more to duplicate those in the *Index*; and the effort and expense devoted to developing them in the *Subject Catalog* should be diverted to the support of the UNESCO project.

Other form headings in the *Subject Catalog* should be considered with reference to comparable coverage elsewhere—in the *Catalog of Copyright Entries*, in the H. W. Wilson Company's *Fiction Catalog* and *Children's Catalog*, in the *Dramatic Index*, and in the various trade and special subject bibliographies. The gaps and inadequacies in our documentation mediums are too serious for us to indulge in the extravagance of doing the same thing in two different bibliographies.

The potentialities of the Library of Congress *Subject Catalog* as the most inclusive current international subject bibliography are great. But there are limits to what it can do well with its present resources. Its integrity and dependability can be insured only if its scope is sensibly limited. A compromise in quality can be avoided by concentrating on what it is fitted to do well and declining to do what is, or can be, done better by other agencies. Its resources might be expanded by a fuller development of the co-operative cataloging program or by the establishment of genuine centralized cataloging and documentation services in a national bibliographic center with adequate federal sup-

port, preferably at the Library of Congress. One of the first tasks of such a national center as was proposed in the *UNESCO/Library of Congress Bibliographical Survey* should be to reconsider the *Author Catalog* and *Subject Catalog* and all other bibliographic services of the Library of Congress in relation to other existing or proposed mediums of documentation, defining the scope of each, and planning to remedy gaps in coverage and to eliminate expensive duplication.<sup>10</sup> If the *Subject Catalog* can be accurate and dependable in its subject analysis of books; if the subject headings used in it are adequate, up to date, and logically integrated; and if it can be made prompt and really comprehensive in its coverage of the recent American and foreign works available in American libraries, then its place in the organization of American bibliography will be assured, and its usefulness will be great indeed. Libraries throughout the country could be relieved of much of the burden of the subject cataloging of current publications and might even discontinue their subject card catalogs for them; and we should see an end to the senseless waste involved when a hundred, or fifty, or even five subject catalogers in different libraries must analyze the same book.

MAY G. HARDY

*University of Chicago Library*

<sup>10</sup> This task may be undertaken in part by the ACRL Committee on Implementing Library of Congress Bibliographical Projects (cf. n. 6, above).

## REVIEWS

*Watermarks Mainly of the 17th and 18th Centuries.* By EDWARD HEAWOOD. ("Monumenta Chartae Papyraceae Historium Illustrantia," No. 1.) Hilversum: Paper Publications Society, 1950. Pp. 154+533 plates. £10.10.0. (300 copies.)

Mr. E. J. Labarre, the enthusiastic and learned founder of the Paper Publications Society, persuaded Mr. Heawood in 1944 to prepare this work for publication, and all students will be grateful to Mr. Labarre for his rescue of this knowledge. From 1907 until his retirement in 1934, Mr. Heawood collected tracings of watermarks. His valuable analyses were published in four important articles in the *Library* during the period 1928-48. This new book presents in one numerical sequence the materials which Mr. Heawood had analyzed, with such corrections, additions, and exclusions as he was able to make before he died in 1949. Mr. Labarre, aided by Mr. G. R. Crone, has indexed, commented, and corrected where possible, but the work is Mr. Heawood's.

To the occasional user, interested chiefly in English books, the analyses in the *Library* will remain more important. They are aimed at a precise problem, the identity of book and map papers used in England. But the publication, in one volume, of the corpus from which the analyses were made will be a constant stimulus to other scholars. By a fortunate association, the late W. A. Churchill, who compiled the other major work in the field, was a friend of Mr. Heawood and a consular chief of Mr. Labarre. The Introduction in Churchill is more detailed and important than the all-too-brief remarks that Mr. Heawood prefixed to the present work before his death. But the two books together provide a modest equivalent, for the period 1600-1760, of the detailed analyses and drawings in Briquet for 1400-1600.

The similarity in design (though not in quantity of examples) to Briquet suggests a major question of policy. We have had numerous special monographs on local paper mills and some on regional tendencies. There have also been sporadic investigations of economic, mercantile, and technological problems, superficial

surveys of single mills, and historico-literary investigations of the problems of particular books. But Briquet, Churchill, and Heawood are the most important attempts to compile records of all observed watermarks with introductory comments. Briquet is, on the whole, satisfying in use, even though one seldom finds the exact example wanted; but both Churchill and Heawood are constantly inadequate and confusing to the user, although the system is the same. I think the explanation is twofold: first, Briquet is relatively much more complete (e.g., he has more examples of an anchor in proportion to the number of sheets made with that device before 1600 than does Heawood, who allows only eight examples for the half-century in which the anchor mark continued in use after 1600); and, second, the conditions of manufacture and use changed from the small home industries for local consumption, typical of the early days, to the wide-ranging export trade of later times. Perhaps a related point is that Briquet worked largely from manuscript archives, where homogeneity of paper supplies is likely to be both more real and more readily apparent, whereas Churchill and, more particularly, Heawood began with heterogeneous books, from which the marks were sporadically recorded as observed. The explanation was somewhat less obvious in Churchill, since his examples were chiefly gathered in Holland and hence primarily of Dutch paper; the examples which he added from such sources as manuscript archives in the Worcester Cathedral Library did not greatly change the preponderance, so that his book was really a collection of Anglo-Dutch, Dutch, and Flemish paper, with a few examples from other sources. Churchill is, in fact, far more limited than Heawood, but rather more useful within his limits.

The discursiveness of Heawood's examples is much more readily apparent in the present work than in his *Library* articles, since, in those, he described only papers used in English-printed books. The only unity of the examples here recorded was produced by Mr. Heawood's position as librarian of the Royal Geographical

Society: he recorded generally the marks in maps and in topographical works, largely folios, on good paper, and so tended to record marks from certain qualities and sizes of paper; but since they were books printed in all countries of western Europe, the sources of the paper supply were thoroughly heterogeneous and unsystematized in his records. His collection is strongest in seventeenth-century French marks, because English and Dutch printers used French papers so generally in that period.

Whether these limitations urge us to abandon Briquet's classification by the designs of the marks, I am not certain. There are materials in Heawood for hundreds of special studies, and every student will use them constantly and gratefully. But I am certain that in Heawood they are difficult to use. (Mr. Labarre's last-minute attempt to index books showing more than one mark is of little direct help; the indexes of designs, names, initials, and dates barely make the general index usable; and the general index is only an identification of the source of each mark: except for a few cross-references, it can attempt no analysis of related marks or sources. My copy, by an unfortunate binding error, lacks eight pages of the general index.) Although I am second to no one in my gratitude for what Mr. Labarre has done, I could wish that he, with Mr. Heawood's help, might have analyzed these marks, matched them with published monographs concerning local or special mills, and prepared several smaller studies to illuminate such matters as characteristics of the paper of certain localities, changing patterns in paper supply, the influence of legal and economic changes, and changing fashions in the use of book papers. Since those phrases may seem a little vague, I suggest a few specific matters not clarified in Heawood, matters that, I hope, other students will work out with the help of Mr. Heawood's book.

1. The movements of paper could be worked out much more precisely than in Mr. Heawood's brief comment on pages 40-41. The English embargo on French trade, 1678-85, and the shutting-off of Italian paper by the War of Jenkins' Ear in 1739—to choose two—are reflected exactly in the book papers used in London.

2. There is no attempt to show the rise of wove paper, and there are, I think, only about a dozen examples of marks in wove (perhaps an aspect of the spotty coverage after about 1760). But one would like to have some word about the

changes in watermarks that it produced and about its spread into writing papers and into other countries. I know that Baskerville used Whatman's new wove for Dodsley's *Aesop* in 1761, but he used Dutch paper in 1760; did Whatman make the wove that was used in part of the *Virgil* in 1757? Nor can one see here any of the fine marks of Johannot, who made the first wove in France, although a single early mark from 1742 is included.

3. Studies of particular makers might well be brought together. The multitude of pots or foolscaps is not especially illuminating, and one would like to see how particular makers began to use new marks. The great Whatman has mostly an uninteresting series of late marks, only two earlier than 1781, so that, although he is mentioned in the Introduction, the text contains no hint of his importance: when did he begin using the initials "JW," and when his full name? There is no information about the Huguenot family of Portal: one mark attributed doubtfully to Portal is certainly correct, but it is lost in the index of initials among at least three other makers. The Taylor firm, very important after 1760, is represented by three marks, one on wove. The mark "Company," correctly assigned by Churchill to the Company of White Paper Makers but incorrectly interpreted by other scholars, is not included or mentioned by Heawood. (Mr. Dard Hunter has recently quoted from Churchill an erroneous date for this mark.)

4. One can guess only with difficulty, after studying the general index, what dates are to be established for the duration of a mark, and one cannot establish at all the dates for its use by a particular mill or region. There are no examples of the foolscap mark for books printed elsewhere than in England and the Low Countries; yet some of these are on French paper. The limiting dates, save for a few uncertainly dated early ones, seem to be 1646 and 1718, but, although these cover its use in England pretty safely, the foolscap was surely in use as a mark for a longer span. Selectivity in the search for examples may have confused the evidence here and elsewhere.

5. The origin of countermarks is doubtfully suggested as a desire to indicate both the maker and the purchaser or patron. But this explanation overlooks the obvious one implicit in the name itself: a countermark, much as in coinage, indicated regularly the particular mill that produced paper of the standard size or quality in-

licated by the watermark. (Of course, it was not literally stamped afterward, as on coins.) Similarly, the relation of watermarks to sheets is doubtfully suggested on page 40 as a tendency to use large designs on large sheets and small ones on small sheets. But again this overlooks or denies the clearly marked relation between size of sheet and mark, as shown by certain names: pot as a mark was obsolete by 1660 on Mr. Heawood's own evidence, and yet the name is still used; the same is true of foolscap, which was superseded as a mark, in Dutch and English paper, by several larger designs, while the old name was kept.

6. An interesting aspect of the trend in watermarks is the changing style of book sizes. The pot quarto of Elizabethan plays was superseded by post and demy quartos, and yet pot paper continued popular for folios, and Johnson's *Poets* are in pot octavo. All single quarto sermons in the early eighteenth century seem to have been printed on foolscap paper, yet plays were larger. Some studies of this nature would presuppose a study of the marks used for standard sizes and qualities in different periods, the study proposed in point 5 above.

7. The whole matter of American paper might well have been omitted, since the two American watermarks recorded have an oddly surprised air of bewilderment at being included.

The book suffers unavoidably but not unduly from the manner of its publication. Some few errors overlooked in proof do no great harm. But I append a few comments or corrections that affect the meaning, mostly matters that Mr. Heawood could have corrected, had he lived.

P. 28 near bottom: "GTM" should read "GMT" (as indexed).

P. 30 top (and No. 1595): The difficulty with Hobbes is not a remainder stock or facsimile but three different printings, for the third of which the plate was re-engraved, and an issue of the first on large paper. An engraved title is also normally on paper different from that used in the text.

P. 32: For Edwards and Fine read Edmeads. (Heawood here copied an error from Churchill.)

No. 915: Undated by Heawood, but can be safely dated ca. 1780-90.

No. 1237: This is referred to (p. 41) as an example of an identical design with a differing name, but only one is illustrated.

No. 1505: Undated, but repeated, from the same source, as No. 1701, where it is dated 1690.

No. 1539: Repeated, from the same source, as No. 1700.

Nos. 1708, 3277, and 3422: The same mark included three times.

No. 3040: The tracing, Anson, suggests an error for Annon[ay].

Nos. 3468-3694: By an unfortunate oversight, the letters in these marks are not indexed.

No. 3714: The measurement of a heavily cut foolscap sheet, here and elsewhere, is misleading and meaningless. Foolscap size allows some variation, especially if both printing and writing papers are included, but the document cited has been trimmed something like 3 inches in each dimension.

No. 3728: End papers are cited as evidence, here and frequently elsewhere. Yet they are clearly two centuries later than the text. Such rebinding often has interest, but in a series like this, where one expects the mark to be dated, perhaps all end papers might have been omitted or segregated. Since they have to be marked "ND," they offer little help. For another example, see No. 3233, dated 1512? but surely a late-eighteenth-century mark.

No. 3862: Shaw's *Travels* should be dated Oxford 1738, not London 1728.

Let us rejoice that Mr. Labarre has given us so much, since our only choice was to have Heawood's collection as it is now printed or nothing at all. Here are more than four thousand marks, many of them not previously recorded. Despite small errors, the tracings are carefully made, and a fine new tool has been made available to students. As with Mr. Labarre's own *Dictionary of Paper*, much is forgiven those who have given us much.

A. T. HAZEN

Columbia University

*The Book in America: A History of the Making and Selling of Books in the United States.* By HELLMUT LEHMANN-HAUPT, in collaboration with LAWRENCE C. WROTH and ROLLO G. SILVER. 2d. ed. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1951. Pp. xiv+493. \$10.00.

Twenty-four years ago Hellmut Lehmann-Haupt first became concerned with the broad matter of book production and distribution in the United States. On this subject he immediately established himself as an authority through his authorship and editorship of the volume of the *Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens* which informed Europeans of the history of the book in America. Two years after his first work, he and his collaborators—Lawrence C. Wroth and Ruth Shepard Granniss—somewhat revised and amplified their study, presenting it to the



United States in 1929 as *The Book in America*. Here, for the first time, Americans could read in their own language a comprehensive volume on all aspects of the book in this country, for the work organized data from many scholarly studies and added to them significant findings of its own. Now another twelve years have passed, and this second and further revised edition has been issued.

The present revision of *The Book in America* draws upon recent specialized treatises and adds its own information on late developments in this nation's book business, such as the growth of book clubs, the new twenty-five-cent books, and the governmental and military distribution of books during World War II.

To include this additional information and yet keep the work in compass required elimination of some material. All but four of Miss Granniss' eighty-seven pages on American book-collecting and the growth of libraries have been deleted, and the title-page no longer includes her name. The text is now confined to book production and distribution, this subject being considered in three parts: (1) from the beginning to the Revolution, (2) from the Revolution to the Civil War, and (3) from the Civil War to the present.

The first part, by Mr. Wroth, is virtually unchanged from the previous edition, except for two new pages on Colonial bookbinding. His information is still so tightly compressed that the section affords less interest for reading than for reference, but it remains the most authoritative, succinct statement on the subject.

The second part is an extension by Rollo G. Silver of Wroth's former section on the middle period of American history. This collaboration adds approximately twenty pages, mainly on the emoluments of authorship, on the government and the book trade, and on cheap books printed in the form of weekly newspapers. The remaining seventy-five pages of Wroth's original text are only very slightly altered, and their organization remains the same.

The third part, by Lehmann-Haupt, is the most substantially revised, its 179 pages having grown to 282. Here the material is not only amplified but reorganized and rewritten in the light of recent history, and passages have been added on regional distribution of publishing, trade sales, and "creative craftsmanship." There are also two new charts, two extra fact-cramped pages on trends in the subject matter

of books published since 1890, five more pages on popular reading tastes from 1860 to 1890, a considerably extended treatment of nineteenth-century subscription sales, and eight additional pages on censorship which take the subject beyond the previous concern with obscenity and pornography to consider the suppression of unpopular ideas and social theories.

Increased space allows Lehmann-Haupt to develop his varied subjects more gracefully and pleasantly than could the writers of the preceding parts. In this last division of the book one no longer meets such a statement as "this cursory treatment of book illustration before 1860 pretends to do no more than remind the reader that the subject is rich and varied," nor is one told that "the growth in popularity of the fictional form . . . is so much a matter of commonplace knowledge that it need not be emphasized." But even in this last section there is evidence of a constant conflict between the attempt to include all relevant subjects and the need for giving a condensed statement of each. The result is that some generalizations are insufficiently developed and others are insufficiently documented. Compression has even led the author to eliminate a six-line footnote reference of the first edition, although he preserves the text about union organization on which it is presumably based. This concern for space probably also accounts for some omissions in this and other parts of the text, so that, for example, the reader can find no reference to the great California publisher Hubert Howe Bancroft or the early New York bookseller and subscription librarian Hoquet Caritat. Some specialized subjects are also scantily treated, with the result that the section on fine printing in California remains, as in the first edition, with its incorrect title of the Grabhorns' "Rare Americana" series and no information on the Book Club of California, the later career of John Henry Nash, or the Colt Press.

The most serious omissions occur in the Bibliography. A book so basic as this needs a bibliography both more inclusive and more conveniently arranged. As now organized, it requires a hunt through several sections for a particular work, and even then the reader cannot tell for what part of the text it was used. Such search also fails to uncover all the works on which the authors themselves drew, so that one can neither find the source of Christopher Morley's comment on Thomas Bird Mosher, which is quoted in the body of the book, nor

locate works to which reference was made in the first edition but which have now been excluded, such as Marion Dodd's "Along New England Book Trails."

The failings are slight by comparison with the values of the book, and they are mentioned less in derogation than in hope that they will be considered when a third edition is ready for the press. Certainly, more editions should be required as time goes on, for the work that Lehmann-Haupt began nearly a quarter-century ago has by now become established as the book on the book in America.

JAMES D. HART

University of California  
Berkeley, California

*The Printed Book.* The original manual by HARRY G. ALDIS, revised and brought up to date by JOHN CARTER and BROOKE CRUTCHLEY. 3d ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1951. Pp. 141. \$1.75.

Aldis' little manual on the printed book, originally published in 1916 and now revised for the second time by two of England's most noted bookmen, has arrived at the dignity of a third edition. To the novice this might appear to be the book to read for a comprehensive survey of its subject. In fact, the jacket blurb tells us that it is "the only one to cover the subject," and the Preface declares it to be "the only manual which attempts to give, within one pair of covers, some account both of the history of the printed book in Europe and of the construction of its constituent parts." These claims are set forth in all apparent seriousness and good faith. It takes some courage to contradict the statements of such eminent authorities, but haven't Mr. Carter and Mr. Crutchley ever heard of Douglas C. McMurtrie's *The Book*, which, whatever its defects, covers the same ground as Aldis' manual and includes, besides, many aspects of the history of the book not touched upon at all by Aldis? Then there is the encyclopedic collection of articles on the history of the book edited by Lawrence C. Wroth and printed as the third number of the *Dolphin*, the best English history of the printed book I know of, which also covers the same ground and includes a great deal omitted by Aldis or barely mentioned in passing.

But perhaps the editors' claim to uniqueness is premised only on the inclusion of the final chapter, entitled "The Handling and Mis-

handling of Books," which is much too brief and elementary a discussion to be of any real use to librarians. This chapter on a topic quite irrelevant to the main purpose of the book occupies 6 of the 119 pages of text, space which could more profitably be used to make the manual more complete in the field of its primary concern.

For instance, here is a manual on the history of the printed book that makes no mention of printing outside Europe and the United States. Readers of Aldis would never suspect that the printing of books was successfully accomplished in China at least six hundred years before Gutenberg and that movable type was invented in China, and again in Korea, centuries before the European invention. Yet surely the oriental contribution to the printed book is sufficient to warrant at least a passing remark in a history of the subject that can include an entire chapter on such matters as how to remove a book from a shelf.

The existence of the printed book in America is recognized by Aldis. According to his manual, American printing burst full grown upon the scene with the work of Bruce Rogers in the twentieth century. There is no discussion of the introduction of printing into the Western Hemisphere and no connected account of the history of American bookmaking. Neither Benjamin Franklin nor Isaiah Thomas is even mentioned, for example.

But they need not feel neglected. It is not an anti-American bias that the author and his editors have exhibited. European printing is treated almost as cavalierly. Geoffroy Tory, one of the master-craftsmen of all time, rates a whole sentence. The Fourniers are not once mentioned in the text, although one of the modern types cut by Pierre-Simon Fournier in 1745 is used in the original and useful appendix illustrating the development of type design. The Didots and Bodoni are casually referred to in connection with Baskerville and his influence, but there is no account of their work and importance in European printing history. The name of the great Spanish printer Joachim Ibarra does not appear at all, nor is there any intimation that Spanish printing extends beyond its introduction into that country.

Now these are, I submit, very grave defects and omissions in a book that is meant to be the standard manual on the history of the printed book—the only work of its kind that many a librarian will ever read.

The narrow limitations of space set by the author and his editors are readily granted to be a good excuse for not including everything and for not giving much detail about anything. The very brevity of the book, together with its subtitle of "manual," would lead us, therefore, to expect a good, comprehensive bibliography with many suggestions for further reading. Here again we are doomed to disappointment. The very brief bibliography or list of "books for further reading" does not mention McMurtrie's or Wroth's histories, or Thomas F. Carter's fine study entitled *The Invention of Printing in China*, and includes only one history of printing in America—Wroth's *Colonial Printer*. This is a list that excludes all works printed in languages other than English. Not even Dr. Carl Wehmer's study of the Cracow fragments, which, the editors admit, necessitated the re-writing of the first chapter, is included in the bibliography or even referred to precisely anywhere.

It would be more honest to entitle this manual "The Printed Book in England with Chapters on the Construction and Care of Books." To advertise it as the only book to cover the subject is downright dishonest. In format and appearance, the third edition is a good average example of present-day British book production—tastefully and accurately printed, though at least one bad typographical error slipped by the proofreaders ("that" for "than" on p. 34). A page-for-page comparison with the 1941 edition revealed very little actual difference between the third and the second edition. The first chapter has been recast; some additions have been made to include developments during the last decade; but nine-tenths of the book is a line-by-line reprint of the earlier edition. There is certainly not enough difference to warrant anyone's throwing away the second edition and buying the new. *The Printed Book*, however, is a clear, concise, and informative exposition of what it does undertake to discuss.

FREDRIC J. MOSHER

School of Librarianship  
University of California

*The Bibliographical History of Anonyma and Pseudonyma.* By ARCHER TAYLOR and FREDRIC J. MOSHER. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951. Pp. ix+289. \$12.50. (Published for the Newberry Library.)

"Librarians who wish only to have an authoritative identification and no more" will nevertheless find something more to interest them in this "book by scholars for scholars" (applying to it the characterization which the authors give to Placcius' *Theatrum anonymorum et pseudonymorum* [1708]). There is the whole literary history and background of this type of bibliography and a good deal of the history of anonymity and pseudonymity itself. We should have welcomed somewhat fuller and more systematic treatment of the anonymous epics and romances and other forms of literature most cultivated by lovers of concealment; and the fourteen motives and twenty-one methods of Baillet's *Auteurs déguisés* (1690) are only a beginning of the enumeration of motives, methods, circumstances, and kinds of people and institutions that it would take to bring us up to date. (On all this, Schneider's *Handbuch der Bibliographie* [1930], chap. xv, may still be recommended.) However, most of these are indicated or suggested (e.g., the extensive bibliographical footnote on p. 83), and major lines of development are well covered.

Homonyms (chap. i) were the bane of antiquity and the middle Ages, and apparently the classic work, "a thesaurus of permanent value," is Johannes Moller's *Homonymoscopia* (1697), which our authors read in microfilm copy at the Newberry Library. "The sixteenth century was the heyday of the Latinized or Hellenized [or Hebraized] name" (chap. ii); most of us know only Franklin's *Dictionnaire* (2d ed., 1879), which is limited to the period 1100–1530, although Moller, Baillet, and others include other names and dates. Pökel's *Philologisches Schriftstellerlexikon* might be added to the list). The investigation of biblical pseudepigrapha and spurious church documents and patristic writings (chap. iii) "had developed a critical method for detecting spurious writings" in general, and until about the middle of the eighteenth century they were included among anonyma and pseudonyma. Chapter iv, the chief part of the book except the Bibliography, describes the work of Placcius, his predecessors (beginning with the list in Konrad Gesner's *Bibliotheca universalis* [1545–55]), his continuators down to Mylius (1740), a date which "marked the end of an epoch," and his successors, for the most part compilers of national dictionaries. Placcius collected practically all information then extant, "studied and traveled widely," enlisted the co-operation

of other scholars by correspondence and questionnaire (among them Magliabecchi, Doni, and Fabricius), was international in scope, "gave at least 8,000 books back to their authors," cited his authorities, and planned his book for reference use. "The first scholarly international dictionary of pseudonyma and anonyma was also the last. . . . Subsequent makers of national dictionaries . . . have not exhausted it. . . . With the exception of Emil Weller, no subsequent bibliographer has sought seriously to make an international dictionary"; and Weller's *Lexicon* (1886), though it includes some 37,000 pseudonyms, does not identify them all, lists few publications, and cites no authorities. The great national lists of the last century are familiar to most of us, but here we have also their history and background well presented. Further, as we know that these dictionaries are incomplete and old or aging, we cannot but welcome information about minor and specialized lists by which we may supplement them. Many important journal articles are cited—and many, presumably less important, omitted. Part C of chapter iv is a liberal sampling of special lists (history, freemasonry, songs, proverbs, Jesuit writings, journalism, books by women, individual authors, etc.), and at least a good start is made toward enumerating national and local bibliographies, biographical dictionaries, and other general works particularly useful for identifying anonyms and pseudonyms. Chapter v, on confusing titles and fictitious publishers, places, and dates, is another extra dividend.

"Librarians who wish only to have an authoritative identification and no more" will find in Part II, Bibliography, many more titles (and annotated) than in Mudge, Schneider, Besterman, Malclès (who distributes them among national bibliographies), or Adah V. Morris (whose "Anonyms and Pseudonyms" should have been a small volume for the reference shelf instead of an article in the *Library Quarterly* [III, 354-72]). But they should be advised that there is more in the book than appears in Bibliography and Index. Do not miss the "Note," at the beginning of the Bibliography, referring to several extensive bibliographical footnotes and listing other bibliographies of dictionaries of anonyms and pseudonyms. Observe that the Index does not cover the Bibliography or the page references given there. To find out what national or special lists there are, look in the Classified Guide (pp. 280-

84) for the names of the authors, then turn to the (alphabetical) Bibliography; then, if the book contains "no formal dictionary," follow references from Bibliography to text; and if the book does contain a dictionary, either be satisfied with the excellent annotation given or consult the Index for references in the text.

HENRY B. VAN HOESEN

Brown University  
Providence, Rhode Island

*Germanistische Handschriftenpraxis: Ein Lehrbuch für die Studierenden der deutschen Philologie.* By JOACHIM KIRCHNER. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1950. Pp. 130. DM. 8.50.

As indicated by its subtitle, Joachim Kirchner's new handbook was designed to meet needs and purposes similar to those which Ronald B. McKerrow set forth in his epoch-making "Notes on Bibliographical Evidence for Literary Students and Editors of English Works of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." After a conscientious reading, the verdict must be that Kirchner's work has been well thought out and that it fulfils the purposes for which it was compiled. For the graduate student in Germanics the work will be a useful vade mecum; for a staff member of a manuscript department the book will have slight value. What the appearance of this treatise especially brings to mind is the complete absence of a suitable "Handbuch der Handschriftenkunde" comparable to McKerrow's *Introduction to Bibliography* or of a guide for the proper description of medieval manuscripts analogous to Fredson Bowers' *Principles of Bibliographical Description*. So far as this reviewer is aware, no such book exists in any language. Karl Löffler's *Einführung in die Handschriftenkunde* simply covers a wider field without giving greater detail; in turn, the Vatican's *Norme per l'indice alfabetico dei manoscritti* and the cataloging rules of the Deutsche Kommission für die Handschrifteninventarisierung are no more than first steps so far as "descriptive bibliography" of manuscripts is concerned.

In his six chapters Kirchner discusses: (1) the physical aspect of manuscripts; (2) literary contents; (3) catalogs of German manuscripts; (4) proper description of manuscripts; (5) editing of texts; and (6) the correct use of manu-

scripts. The treatment in each of these divisions is adequate for the announced purposes, though it is comparatively simple to point to sins of omission and those of commission here and there. For example, the second chapter completely overlooks the German drama, whether in verse or in prose, though this form of art constituted a significant part of late-medieval German literary history. Again (on p. 5) Kirchner writes:

Ein so staunenswertes Gedächtnis bewunderte ich einmal bei einem französischen Bibliographen, der mit der Erinnerungsgabe für Signaturschildchen und sonstige Äusserlichkeiten der Bücher auch eine hervorragende Kenntnis alter Auktionskataloge verband, so dass er eine Autorität für die Geschichte der Büchersammlungen und damit auch der beste Experte bei der Ermittlung von Provenienzen von Büchern und Handschriften war.

This can apply to only one person (Seymour de Ricci), though neither he nor his great catalog of medieval manuscripts found in this country is mentioned by name.

If anyone wishes to analyze a manuscript according to Kirchner's suggestions, the results will be thorough and satisfactory. However, here too improvements suggest themselves to the writer. Following Chroust and Löffler, this sort of collation is recommended (p. 15): II(4) + 8IV(68) + III(74) + (V-1) (83) + 7IV(139) + VI(151). The method employed by Montague Rhodes James (1<sup>st</sup> 2-9<sup>th</sup> 10<sup>th</sup> 11<sup>th</sup> [wants 10] 12-18<sup>th</sup> 19<sup>th</sup>) seems much less clumsy and easier to follow. Reference by quires, which is frequent and important in checking manuscripts, is simpler through James's formula. According to this method, if one wishes to note that two quires are by a second scribe, a note to that effect tells the reader exactly where and how many leaves were thus written. It would take a bit of computing to discover from Kirchner's collation how many leaves formed quires 11 and 12 and what the relation of these quires to the volume might be.

Errors there are also. On page 14 Kirchner defines a quaternion as a quire consisting of "vier Blättern" (it should be "double leaves"); on page 43 he suggests that there was only a single incunable edition of Ortolf von Baierland's *Arzneibuch* (Klebs lists seven editions); and on page 64 he prints "Specilegium" for the correct "Spicilegium." Other examples might be cited.

Some American libraries, it is rumored, do not always "encourage" outside scholars to

study and use their medieval manuscripts, though, happily, this is not true (I believe) of the library which I have the honor to serve. Kirchner (p. 120) wisely reminds us that the value of a manuscript does not diminish through use for editorial purposes or citation.

So kann [eine Handschrift] doch jeder Zeit bei fortschreitender Wissenschaft von neuem in den Brennpunkt gelehrten Interesses treten und zu neuen Untersuchungen herangezogen werden, die unter Umständen zu ganz anders gearteten Ergebnissen als die der ersten Ausgabe führen.

This is a point which it is well worth emphasizing.

All in all, the book under review has something to offer every reader and a great deal to offer the graduate student in Germanic literature. It will certainly prove to be a valuable work of reference for the manuscript section of any large scholarly library.

CURT F. BÜHLER

*The Pierpont Morgan Library*  
New York, New York

*Den orientaliska boken: Skrift och Bokväsen i Islams värld.* By BERNHARD LEWIN. ("Grafiska Institutets Skriftserie," No. 5.) Stockholm: Hugo Gebers Förlag, 1951. Pp. 70. Sw. Kr. 6:75.

*Engelskt boktryck.* By Sir FRANCIS MEYNELL. ("Grafiska Institutets Skriftserie," No. 6.) Stockholm: Hugo Gebers Förlag, 1951. Pp. 61. Sw. Kr. 6:00.

*Gutenberg.* By CARL BJÖRKBOM. (Grafiska Institutets Skriftserie," No. 7.) Stockholm: Hugo Gebers Förlag, 1951. Pp. 64. Sw. Kr. 6:75.

Bror Zachrisson, well known in this country as a visiting professor at Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1950-51, and Samuel E. Bring are the editors of the "Skriftserie" of the Grafiska Institutet in Stockholm. In addition to the titles listed in the caption of this review, they have previously selected for publication four other valuable manuals on the history of books and printing, viz., Axel Nelson's *Alfabetets ursprung och den västerländska skriftens historia till boktryckarkonstens framträdande* (No. 1 [1947]), the late Isak Collijn's *Svensk boktryckerihistoria under 14- och 1500-talen* (No. 2 [1947]), Nils G. Wollin's *Svenska stilgjuteriet*:



*Peter Mommas skapelse* (No. 3 [1947]), and Bring's *Handledning i svensk bibliografi* (No. 4 [1948]). All are significant, but the last, in particular, has a place in every research library's reference collection.

The subtitle of Lewin's book is more accurate than the main title, since he deals exclusively with the Islamic book. The text is divided into sections on language and writing, the scholar and the poet, the copyist and the calligrapher, illustration, binding, collecting, and printing. There are twelve facsimiles and photographs showing various aspects of the physical book as it has developed in the Near East. Readers of the *Nordisk Tidskrift för Bok- och Biblioteksväsen*—and there should be many, now that this journal includes résumés in English—will be familiar with the H. Ritter collection of photographs of oriental manuscripts at Uppsala on which Lewin depends heavily for his illustrations. This important archive consists of some one hundred thousand exposures of leaves in about two thousand Arabic, Persian, and Turkish manuscripts in the libraries of Istanbul, and it was described by Lewin in the *NTBB* in 1950 (XXXVII, 22-29).

Lewin's study of over a thousand years of Mohammedan books, from the earliest period through the introduction of printing in Istanbul in 1729, is a model of restraint and compactness. In each chapter there are countless facets for additional study in fields not nearly so well cultivated as corresponding ones in western Europe have been, but Lewin sternly resists all temptations to digress from his brief but comprehensive survey. The story of collecting and libraries, the geographical range of Islam's intellectual influence, and the transformations of books and ideas in the hands of the various peoples of Islam offer the material for a bibliographical geography unrivaled even by the history of the Latin book of the Occident.

Carl Björkbom's little book on Gutenberg is actually an abbreviated edition of his *Johann Gutenberg till 500 årsmänet av uppfinnningen av boktryckarkonsten* (1940). Like the original, it is an orthodox presentation of the Gutenberg story as it is generally accepted; the important difference is that it takes into account, and accepts the conclusions of, Carl Wehmer's remarkable analysis of the Astronomical Calendar for 1448. Björkbom, librarian of the Tekniska Högskolan, is particularly fluent in his discussion of the technological backgrounds of printing. The various illustrations (including

three-color reproductions of pages from B-42, B-36, the *Missale speciale*, and the Psalter of 1457) are well executed; but the facsimile of the 1455 deposition of Fust before Ulrich Helmsperger is reduced too much to be legible. Björkbom furnishes a valuable introduction to the field of prototypography, guiding the uninitiated with a sure and experienced hand, avoiding the many scholarly debates that are likely to obscure the subject for the beginner but maintaining an open mind toward unsolved problems, and treating the figure of Gutenberg with somewhat greater objectivity than one is likely to find in many German studies.

Sir Francis Meynell's popular brochure on *English Printed Books* (1946), translated as *Engelskt boktryck*, should be better known in America. The master of the Nonesuch Press philosophizes on the nature of the English book and draws pertinent examples from the last two and a half centuries of printing in Britain. Well illustrated and carefully designed, the translation does justice to its worthy original and is a good example to set for other translations of foreign books which may find their way into the "Skriptserie."

LAWRENCE S. THOMPSON

University of Kentucky Libraries  
Lexington, Kentucky

*Colon Classification*. By S. R. RANGANATHAN.  
3d ed. ("Publication Series," No. 16.) Madras: Madras Library Association, 1950.  
\$6.00.

On this side of the Atlantic the Colon Classification has been viewed with a suspicious skepticism that has largely obscured the many merits that the scheme possesses. No doubt this is due at least in part to the early and well-nigh universal adoption of the classifications devised by Melvil Dewey and the Library of Congress. In England, by contrast, where the urge to classify library book collections came relatively late, Ranganathan's schematism has been received with much greater sympathy and enthusiasm. There the Colon Classification has not only gained vigorous and active support, but it has been actually adopted by a number of libraries, and there have even been attempts to reconstitute certain of the older systems, notably the UDC, to fit the Ranganathan principle of facet analysis.

But in the United States popular enthusiasm for the Colon system has been further impeded in two ways. Superficially, the esoteric terminology of the scheme has discouraged an objective appraisal of its merits. The serious student of library classification soon discovers that Ranganathan has not lightly devised a patois to obscure any philosophical weaknesses in his plan, but that, actually, he is using his terms with the greatest accuracy and precision, and that they are logical verbal correlates of the ideas and purposes with which he is dealing. The average American librarian, on the other hand, regards library classification as little more than a location device to guide him to the position of a particular title on the shelf. This is the natural outgrowth of the emphasis placed upon the small general library in American librarianship. For such libraries only a few broad subject classes are really needed, and the criticism has been frequently made that minute classification has been carried too far. Such criticism ignores the growing need among large research libraries and, more particularly, among special libraries which must meet exacting bibliographic requirements, for a classification system which will quickly and accurately isolate from a large volume of materials the precise unit of information needed. In approaching the Colon Classification, the American librarian must not only orient his thinking toward this type of bibliographic manipulation but must also be prepared to confront a terminology which, to him, appears to be quite incomprehensible. Faced in proper context with such expressions as "Denudation," "Lamination," "Loose-assembly," "Gap-notation," and "Facet Analysis," he must not reject the whole as an incomprehensible figment of an alien imagination.

Fundamentally, however, the real barrier to the understanding of the Colon Classification arises from the fact that it is founded in a philosophical orientation that is foreign to our own theories as to what a library classification should be. The Dewey and L.C. schedules are extensive and elaborate lists of terms, each of which is intended to describe the subject content of books, the whole being arranged in a hierarchical sequence that approximates the particular opinion of some individual or individuals as to the fundamental order of the several fields of knowledge. To these schedules has been applied a notation system that provides a ready-made class number for every topic. Hence the introduction of the new topics, which have not been antici-

pated by the makers of the scheme, often jeopardizes the underlying logic of the entire structure, if it does not actually do violence to it. This does not bother American librarians very much, for, though they pay lip service to the doctrine that the classification should provide a logical subject approach to the contents of the book collection, most of them employ its notation as merely a locational tool, with little thought for its subject significance or its relation to those subjects which immediately precede or follow.

Early in his professional career, however, Ranganathan recognized that all human knowledge is composed of a relatively few basic subjects which may be arranged, combined, and interrelated in an almost infinite variety of ways. Thus, about 1925, as a student of Berwyck Sayers, he began to lay the foundation for a scheme that would provide complete flexibility or, in his own words, "infinite hospitality." This principle was first enunciated by James Duff Brown, who provided in the "Categorical Table" to his classification a limited number of subject subdivisions which could be applied at more than one point throughout his schedules, but it was Ranganathan's Colon Classification, first published in 1933, that carried the method to its logical limits. Basically, then, the scheme is a series of systematic schedules (of which the schedule of subjects is the major one) which may be linked in an almost limitless variety of combinations, each individualized by the colon. Ranganathan himself has likened it to a Meccano set, the standard pieces of which may be assembled in a number of ways to construct many quite different mechanical objects. "So also, by combining the numbers in the different unit-schedules in assigned permutations and combinations, the Class Numbers for all possible topics can be constructed" (p. 1.11).

Ranganathan has further recognized that specific fields of knowledge may "throw forth" new specific subjects in four major ways: (a) "Denudation," which results in subordinated classes or chains of classes; (b) "Dissection," which results in co-ordinate classes or arrays of classes; (c) "Lamination," which results in composite classes; and (d) "Loose-assembly," which results in combination-classes. Each of these specific fields is composed of an undetermined number of facets, each with its own focus, but all of which may be regarded as manifestations of one or another of his five "Funda-

mental Categories"—Time, Space, Energy or Action, Matter, and Personality. In the scheme as it is elaborated in the present edition there are nine preliminary classes, which divide the main subject classes by time, by place, by language, etc.; twenty-six main subject classes, beginning with Mathematics and concluding with Law; and eight devices employed to fix aspects, e.g., Favored Category, Bias, etc. It is manifestly impossible in a severely limited space to do full justice to the scheme;<sup>1</sup> but perhaps enough has been said to show that Ranganathan has departed from the usual concept of bibliothecal classification and, by freeing it from the book as the physical unit of classification, has taken an important step in directing attention toward the need to examine the "concept" or "information unit" as the more effective basis for the arrangement and analysis of bibliographic materials. Further advances in the refinement of bibliographic classification must wait upon a series of case studies in the methods of analyzing the literature of specific subject fields, so that the information units used by research workers in these respective areas may be isolated and identified. Once this has been done, it should not be too difficult to measure the adequacy of existing schemes of bibliothecal classification and to devise new schematisms appropriate to the new demands upon classification and to the potentialities of the new mechanical and electronic high-speed sorting devices. A few such studies are already under way at the Graduate Library School and elsewhere, and more are to be expected as new techniques for research in this field are developed. In the meantime, careful study of the values of such schemes as the Colon Classification would seem to be indicated.

The physical feature of the Colon Classification which most forcibly strikes the occidental user is the absence of great physical bulk. Because the scheme is founded upon a mnemonic system of interchangeable parts in varying combinations, it is possible to publish all the schedules together with the preliminary explanations and indexes in a small volume of less than 450 pages—a marked contrast indeed to the 2,000 pages required for the fourteenth edition

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the best brief exposition is to be found in S. R. Ranganathan, "The Colon Classification and Its Approach to Documentation" in J. H. Shera and Margaret E. Egan (eds.), *Bibliographic Organization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), pp. 94-105.

of Dewey and the shelf-full of volumes that is the Library of Congress classification.

It would be impracticable in this review to consider in detail the alterations in the second (1939) edition which the present compilation represents. Suffice it here to point out that, in the preceding edition, Part IV was devoted to some three thousand examples, presented in the form of a classified catalog, to illustrate the Colon numbers. Because such illustrative material was no longer considered necessary, Part IV is here a detailed presentation of topics in Indology. Changes in the schedules themselves have been relatively slight except in the fields of physics, literature, and education. A future, fourth edition will undoubtedly benefit from the research now being done under Ranganathan's direction and pointed toward an analysis of the depth of classification needed for adequate documentary indexing and abstracting of the several fields of knowledge.

It is a reasonably safe gamble that American librarians in general, and catalogers and classifiers in particular, will pay scant heed to this schematism so meticulously developed by India's foremost librarian-scholar; but it is also equally certain that this indifference is founded in a prevalent lack of concern for the growing importance of classification to effective bibliographic management and a reluctance to expend the mental effort required to comprehend the philosophical bases of the Colon system. The reviewer does not mean to imply that American librarians should immediately begin the relettering of their books with the Colon notation, but he is convinced that Ranganathan is blazing a trail along which future theorists of library classification must follow and that, if we fail to heed his markings, we may very soon lose ourselves in the ever deepening forests of contemporary print.

J. H. SHERA

*Graduate Library School  
University of Chicago*

*Bibliography in an Age of Science.* By LOUIS N. RIDENOUR, RALPH SHAW, and ALBERT G. HILL; with a Foreword by ROBERT B. DOWNS. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951. Pp. 90. \$2.50.

This book is correctly named, but its scope is much wider than would appear to the casual reader. The word "bibliography" in its title

must be understood to comprehend all the operations by which libraries assemble and organize information in recorded form and produce it for their customers. Containing the sober reflections and recommendations on this subject of two well-known physicists with extensive interests and experience in the problems of communication, as well as those of a librarian who has given foremost attention to technological applications in library work, this slim, absorbing, and provocative volume deserves to be read widely by the members of the profession to which it was addressed, not merely by those who profess an interest in "bibliographic organization" in any narrow sense.

First, however, it ought to be said just what the book is. It contains the text of three lectures given at the University of Illinois in the spring of 1950, comprising the second series of the "Windsor Lectures in Librarianship." As related in the Foreword by Robert B. Downs, it was decided, in view of the increasing awareness of the acceleration of research and of the inadequacy of existing methods for providing access to the recorded results of research, to focus this second series of the "Windsor Lectures" on scientific aids to learning, teaching, and research. For this purpose it would probably have been impossible to improve upon the choice of the lecturers from the point of view of their authority in their fields and their related experience and interests.

Louis N. Ridenour (the well-known nuclear and radiation physicist, at that time still dean of the Graduate College of the University of Illinois) did a first-rate job in the title-lecture of the series. His thesis is twofold: first, technology has got libraries into their present fix, and only technology offers any promise of getting them out again; second, any technical goal is always possible of achievement, and the only sensible question is whether a particular achievement is justified by economic considerations. Between these two points Dean Ridenour summarizes library operations, disposes of most present attempts to improve them, advances a new technique of improvement, and gives numerous examples of the development which might result from its application. He also throws in (and not at all irrelevantly, as might appear) a law of social change, for which he develops an elegant mathematical expression in an appendix. (Incidentally, the Library of Congress printed catalog card for this book—51-11147—does not disclose the existence of either

this appendix or the discussion of the subject.)

Briefly, Dean Ridenour finds that the exponential rate of growth, which Fremont Rider discovered to be true of the collections of great research libraries, is a normal characteristic of every worth-while aspect of human life. (Indeed, he feels that the recent falling off from this rate in some of our largest libraries is a measure of the inadequacy of present library methods; and he comments caustically on the authoritative assertions of inability to do their job effectively with which libraries, he says, are confronted.) In the face of such growth, merely procedural developments, such as union catalogs, division of responsibility for acquisition, and interlibrary centers, can be nothing more than palliatives. Unconventional methods must be adopted, for technical limitations can be overcome by a vigorous and progressive technology. He categorizes library work as consisting, broadly, of acquisition, storage, indexing, and reference functions. He urges, as the first step, that the techniques of operational research be applied to each of these functions, and he illustrates his recommendation. Under the head of acquisition, for example, he finds that no library has more than a fraction of all publications, while, at the same time, there is an enormous amount of duplicative overlapping among collections. Thus in 1948-49 twenty-six university libraries spent in excess of five million dollars on acquisitions—a sum that not only would be large enough to pay for the operation of "a rather fancy" communication system for the entire group of libraries but would, in addition, provide the individual libraries in the group with ampler funds than they now have available beyond their cost of staff maintenance.

On the subject of storage, Dean Ridenour touches lightly on the possibilities of compression through the use of microfacsimile and of electronic memory systems, and he questions the necessity for the domination of library techniques by the preference for visual methods of receiving information. He suggests the possibility of mechanizing the work of cataloging, however visionary that may sound, and concludes that "it is probably the steps involved in providing an analytical bibliography which would first engage the attention of an open-minded engineer determined to reduce library costs and raise library efficiency."

"Machines and the Bibliographical Problems of the Twentieth Century" is the title of



the paper by Ralph Shaw, the electronically minded librarian of the United States Department of Agriculture. It is a rapid survey of some recent technological applications to bibliographic work, including storage, sorting, and reproducing devices, with a more extended consideration of the Rapid Selector and a statement of some principles. He reminds us that bibliography was originally concerned with physical objects (books, etc.) and only latterly has turned to the ideas expressed in them (through subject analysis, etc.); he feels that the disjunction between the physical object and the analysis constitutes a principal problem of library work—one for which devices such as the Rapid Selector offer a prospect of solution. He insists, as he has insisted before, that, although we now have machines capable of doing higher orders of bibliographical work than have been achieved in the past, they will only serve to do more of what we have been able to do in the past until we ascertain by study just what it is that we want to achieve.

The final paper in the series is "The Storage, Processing and Communication of Information" by Professor Hill, at one time an engineer for the Bell Telephone Laboratories, at present director of M.I.T.'s Research Laboratory on Electronics and chairman of the committee in charge of the work of its Center for Scientific Aids to Learning, which was established under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. Professor Hill's paper deals especially with researches under way at the Center—on the use of microfilm for personal libraries, speech analysis, coding, and indexing, feedback systems for teaching the deaf to talk, information theory, etc. To meet the problems of libraries, Professor Hill recommends an analogy from communication practice—systems engineering. Just as a third telephone added to two existing instruments produces the need for a switching device and creates a system (and the complexity of the switching device increases with the square of the number of instruments), so in library work the complexity of the intermediating mechanism has increased with the number of sources of information. Following the analogy with telephone work and the electronic computers, Professor Hill prescribes work toward the definition of the components of a library system—its storage reservoirs, its coding, its brain, the method of programming the system, its internal and external communications, and methods of reproduction of the informational

records. He is quite confident that the techniques of systems engineering will solve these problems.

"Operational analysis," "scientific management," "systems engineering"—each of the authors has his name for the technique which is to enable libraries to do their job adequately. Each is confident of the competence of the technique to do the job. There are few mentions, indeed, of economic or other social implications. With such a unanimity from the world of pure and applied science, should librarians fail to be impressed and to act with unanimity?

A note on bookmaking: the volume before us was more than a year in publication and bears evidences of unusually sympathetic treatment at the hands of its publishers. Charts are excellent and varied, typographically and otherwise; adornments are attractively and cleverly adapted from the punched-card and electronic-selector devices. The title-page is in color, and the book jacket is striking and apt. Typographical errors are negligible. There is a glossary as well as the appendix already mentioned. It is a bit ungrateful, therefore, to mention any defects, but to do so is in the interest of future, even closer approximation to perfection. The sans serif type, on dead-white coated paper, has a somewhat dazzling effect on this reader's eyes, and the italic in the font is insufficiently differentiated from the roman. The book jacket, a lacquered job, sticks unpleasantly to the reader's hands. These, it is admitted, are trifles. On the whole, the Windsor Lectures have set themselves a high standard both in content and in form.

VERNER W. CLAPP

*Library of Congress  
Washington, D.C.*

---

*Federal Records of World War II, Vols. I and II. Issued by the NATIONAL ARCHIVES. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951. Pp. 2,134. \$5.00.*

These two large volumes are, in the words of United States archivist Wayne C. Grover, "an over-all guide to wartime records." The use of the word "guide" in the title would have indicated the scope and intent of the compilation. Archivists have found that huge collections of records are best described in a guide which, as the term implies, leads the researcher through the maze of records (which, in the case of the



federal government, are accumulated by the ton). It has taken the compilers of the *Federal Records of World War II* a total of 1,904 pages of closely printed text merely to describe the federal records which were created during 1939-45. An additional 230 pages are devoted to a minute and comprehensive index. A staggering total of 3,057 agencies, divisions, boards, commissions, bureaus, offices, committees, and the like receive treatment and analysis.

This is not only a commentary on the complexity of modern government but an indication of the problems confronted by the compilers of the guide. It was necessary to describe the history and functions of each agency or subdivision that created records during the war. One volume is devoted to the civilian agencies and one volume to military agencies. Each agency or division is introduced by a brief statement containing the administrative history of the unit. This statement gives the date of the establishment of the agency and then describes the work done by the agency as defined by law or practice. In a work of this scope it was manifestly impossible to detail the record group through actual examination of the records themselves. Not only were many of the records unavailable for security or other reasons, but the job obviously was too formidable to be undertaken. On the whole, the descriptive analysis is exceedingly well done and should enable a researcher to locate those files in which he is interested. Following the historical and descriptive part, the editors have appended a statement concerning the records of each of the 3,037 agencies and subdivisions. The discussion of the records is largely a quantitative one—holdings are described in terms of "feet" (presumably linear feet). Thus, one wishing to consult the records of the Office of War Information faces the unhappy prospect of examining 4,580 feet of records materials in the Domestic Operations Branch and the Overseas Operations Branch alone. "Many" or "most" of these are in the National Archives; but it is hard to reconcile the figures given in Volume I, page 548, with the separate figures given on pages 551 and 563.

As a compendium of the agencies concerned with the war effort, the work will be useful to reference librarians. The bibliographic notes on published items are of particular value. The individual scholar interested in doing research on any particular aspect of the war will find small comfort in the mass of records that will

confront him. However, if he is prepared to study and consider thousands of documents, the guide will make the work infinitely easier for him.

The compilers of the two volumes are to be congratulated on illuminating a most difficult and stirring period in American history.

WILLIAM J. VAN SCHREEVEN

*Virginia State Library*  
Richmond, Virginia

---

*The Reference Librarian in University, Municipal and Specialised Libraries.* Edited with an Introduction by JAMES D. STEWART. London: Grafton & Co., 1951. Pp. 288. 25s.

Few titles concerned exclusively with the reference function of libraries have been published. It was to be hoped, therefore, that the present volume would constitute an outstanding addition to this small body of literature, and it is disappointing to find that this is not the case. Reference work, the liaison service between books and readers, has many facets, as everyone knows, and is so strongly conditioned by the organization of the library and the location and arrangement of materials that writings on the subject have a tendency to bog down into elementary treatises on library science in general. The present volume can, perhaps, be best described as an account of practice and procedures in various types of reference libraries, supplemented by an introductory chapter by James D. Stewart and a final annotated list, "Essential Books for the Reference Library," by A. J. Walford. The intervening chapters include "Reference Work in University Libraries" by George H. Bushnell, "Reference Work in Municipal Libraries" by Lucy I. Edwards, "Municipal Commercial and Technical Libraries" by Richard Haxby, "Scientific and Technical Research Libraries" by Mabel Exley, "Reference Work in Medical Libraries" by John L. Thornton, and an anonymous chapter, "Newspaper Reference Libraries."

The contributors, each of whom describes a type of library represented by his own present field of endeavor, speak from experience and undoubtedly have covered the assigned topics reasonably well, though the volume suffers from the usual weaknesses of a symposium—much unavoidable duplication and an unevenness in the quality of the articles, one or two of which

are marred by monotony of style and an extremely elementary tone. There is little that is original or has not been said elsewhere, but this is hardly the fault of the contributors, since a brief description of the work of a particular kind of reference library can scarcely be expected to offer more than a superficial introduction to the subject, as one of the authors points out. Technical processes and routines, including the treatment of special types of material, receive a large share of attention in most of the papers, and the inclusion of forms and lists of various sorts may prove of practical aid to other librarians. Mr. Haxby, for example, describing the work of the Library of Commerce and Technology of the Leeds Public Libraries, includes a proposed system for the classification of directories and also a subject guide to abstracts. Brief historical and descriptive material about libraries in the field adds to the interest of some of the chapters, notably that of Mr. Thornton, who also has supplied one of the best bibliographies for those who want to delve more deeply into the subject, since, unlike some of the others, it excludes titles of reference books and other writings mentioned in the article.

A number of the articles are enlivened by personal comments, some of which are decidedly controversial. Mr. Bushnell's chapter on university libraries contains several points that will interest and challenge American librarians: for example, his insistence upon the development of a more critical attitude toward reference books. He refers to the "ancillary work of correcting and analyzing printed works" as a legitimate function of the university library. For the purpose of such libraries, he expands Weyer's well-known definition of reference work to one which is certainly alarming in its implications: "the willing, generous, understanding and informed personal aid given to users of the library, by bringing light to bear upon, explaining and expounding any information contained in the library's collections which is not obvious." Though lists of reference books abound, Dr. Walford's pertinent comments make his list a welcome addition. Since subject fields are included, it supplements A. D. Roberts' *Introduction to Reference Books* (Library Association, 1948) and earlier British lists. In the compass of this review it is impossible to explore the individual articles adequately, but it is to be hoped that these few examples will give some idea of the content.

The question of the purpose and use of the

volume naturally arises. The only clue given by Mr. Stewart in the Introduction is contained in the concluding sentences. He says: "The present volume deals with the work of the reference librarian from various and detached points of view. Its chapters are the work of specialists in a particular field and although each is self-contained and written without referring to, or coordination with, the others, they contain much useful guidance for reference librarians in all kinds of libraries. An old colleague of mine accomplished the remarkable feat of producing a substantial, and widely welcomed, volume on reference library methods without devoting a single page to the work of the reference library and its librarian! The present volume should remedy this." If Mr. Stewart is referring to John Warner's *Reference Library Methods* (Grafton, 1928), we must ask whether the present work does much more for the reference librarian than the former, after making due allowance for the date of publication. Though the plan is different, both have much to say on technical processes, and both touch on many of the same questions throughout. Mr. Warner's chapters on the commercial departments of the larger public libraries and on technical and other special libraries cover much the same ground as those by Mr. Haxby and Miss Exley, though Mr. Warner is concerned with such libraries in general and gives less detail about routines. Certainly, the difference in content between the two volumes is not so striking as one would expect from Mr. Stewart's allusion. While it is true, as has been indicated, that librarians will find some helpful suggestions in this book, its chief use would seem to be as an introductory picture of reference work in various types of libraries, and of the duties connected with it, for the beginning librarian or student of library science. The reference use of the volume (and Mr. Stewart reminds us that all books are reference books) would have been greatly facilitated if an index had been supplied. A librarian who wants to compare the statements of several of the authors on a topic—for example, the treatment of newspaper cuttings—will find it difficult indeed to ferret out the relevant sections.

Undoubtedly, writings in the field of reference work are concerned with too many of its aspects and thus become superficial and repetitious, and the time has probably come for a more discerning examination of individual factors. Perhaps a penetrating study of the refer-

ence librarian—the skills and knowledge needed, the traits, the mingling of scholarly and administrative attributes, his unique opportunity of exploring the mass of literature in order to release those items best adapted to meet the needs of a particular inquirer, his rewards, his place in the library and in the world of learning—will some day be forthcoming. Such a study should not stray into the tempting field of reference books and materials and bibliographic control or into the byways of technical processes and general library techniques. In the meantime, the present volume may serve a useful purpose for students of library science and for the staffs of any of the types of libraries here presented.

MARY N. BARTON

*Enoch Pratt Free Library*  
Baltimore

---

*Reference Books: A Brief Guide for Students and Other Users of the Library.* Compiled by MARY NEILL BARTON. 2d ed. Baltimore: Enoch Pratt Free Library, 1951. Pp. 99. \$0.75.

Of the 431 titles in this second edition, 61 are new. Some 21 titles included in the previous edition have been dropped. The aim remains the same—to help library users. Consequently, the annotations avoid consideration of technical makeup and arrangement and emphasize reader use.

Part 1 lists and annotates briefly the general reference books. Photographs of standard reference books add to the visual interest. Part 2 includes selected basic reference books in the special subjects of history, literature, art, sciences, social sciences, psychology, philosophy, religion, and mythology.

The reviewer knows firsthand how difficult it is to satisfy all reference librarians on any selection. Habit, library-school influence, availability of certain titles, firsthand knowledge of editors, publishers, and books influence reference workers to defend spiritedly one dictionary as against another, one encyclopedia above all others. In this reviewer's opinion, however, Miss Barton and her colleagues on the Enoch Pratt Library staff rate a very high score on their judgment.

Among the titles that might be added from the user's standpoint are these: *Who Knows—and What*, sample college, high-school, and chil-

dren's dictionaries, *Bartholomew Advanced Atlas*, *Soule Library Handbook for Chemists*, cook-books, household-books, and, in fact, a whole section on "how-to-do-it" books. But even if these suggestions are accepted and totaled, they make fewer than forty titles, thus giving Miss Barton a score of well over 90 per cent.

The annotations are truly helpful. In the crucible of graduate student use by nonlibrarians, this second edition has proved most functional. It has aided Master's candidates, many of whom have had no previous library instruction, to move confidently among the university's reference collections.

To public and college library users everywhere, *Reference Books* is recommended as an aid to study and research.

LOUIS SHORES

*Florida State University*  
Tallahassee

---

*Les Sources du travail bibliographique*, Vol. I: *Bibliographies générales*. By L. N. MALCLÈS. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1950. Pp. xvi + 364.

Out of Miss Malclès' vast experience as a teacher of library science and as a librarian at the Sorbonne, there now appears the first of a three-volume set which will be a guide to bibliographies—both general and specialized. The two other volumes will treat the bibliography of the humanities and of the exact and technical sciences.

The first six chapters discuss (1) the over-all problem, with a definition of bibliography; (2) bibliographies of bibliographies; (3) universal bibliographies; (4) the history of the book in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; (5) printed catalogs of libraries; and (6) a summary of the latest information concerning the status of union catalogs in nine European countries and the United States. Chapters viii through xii deal with the history of the encyclopedia, especially in France; biographical dictionaries; the problems connected with periodical bibliography, with special emphasis on newspapers; publications of learned societies; magazines and their indexing; and *Festschriften*.

Each of these chapters is introduced by a historical and evaluative statement concerning the field, and a bibliography with many of the entries annotated concludes the chapter. Many of these bibliographies are of great value. To

mention but one, there is a bibliography of the official cataloging codes in use in seven important European countries and the United States.

Yet the fullest, most interesting, and most valuable section of this volume is dedicated to a bibliographical treatment of the national bibliographies of the major western European countries and North America by Miss Malclès and of the Slavic and Balkan countries by various other experts (pp. 112-212, 279-336). No attention is paid to the national bibliographies of Latin America (with the exception of Mexico), and the countries of Asia and Africa are ignored. The bibliography of national bibliographies for each country includes both retrospective and current works, book-selection aids, government publications (indexes and guides to their use), anonyms and pseudonyms, theses, and first editions and rare books. Each country's section ends with a selective listing of important professional journals currently published. It will be noted that for Malclès the term "national bibliography" has a much wider meaning than it does either for Olga Pinto (*Le bibliografie nazionali* [Firenze, 1951]) or for the compilers of the list of national bibliographies that appeared in the *Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions of the Library of Congress* (1949-51), though it is true that both of these present information concerning more countries.

The specialist in national bibliography will find the section dealing with the Slavic and Balkan countries to be most informative. Russian national bibliography is presented in thirty-four pages, and this—as far as the reviewer knows—is the longest recent discussion on this subject in a western European language. Much information is here assembled concerning Russian bibliography that should be of immense value to researchers and librarians interested in the use of Russian materials or in building up a collection of Russian bibliographies.

The extreme up-to-dateness of the volume is remarkable, for numerous 1950 publications are listed; occasionally, however, careful study of the material cited leads one to conclude that the writer has not always studied or seen some of these recent works. Thus, though the work by Homero Serís (*Manual de bibliografía de la literatura española* [1949]) is mentioned, it is not noted that its "Obras bio-bibliográficas" section is quite useful in supplementing the *Manuel de l'Hispanisant* discussed on pages 158-59. One might occasionally quibble with

the annotations which are more factual than evaluative. The author calls the *Manual del librero hispano-americano* (p. 160) "estimée et indispensable," yet she gives no warning that the volume must be used cautiously because of its inaccuracies and typographical errors. On the whole, considering the number of languages involved, the present work is relatively free of typographical errors, and no serious errors of fact have been uncovered. Occasional inconsistencies in author entry exist, but they in no way mar the utility or value of the work. The Index is a competent and thorough piece of work and lists authors, titles, and broad subjects.

This volume should prove of value to all those interested in bibliography and its problems. It is to be hoped that the next two volumes will be as useful, thorough, up to date, and international in scope and that they will meet the scholarly standards set by the first volume.

HENSLEY C. WOODBRIDGE

University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois

*Virginia Gazette Index, 1736-1780*, Vols. I and II. By LESTER J. CAPPON and STELLA F. DUFF. Williamsburg, Va.: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1950. Pp. ix+1314. \$60.00.

The *Virginia Gazette Index* is the result of an undertaking begun in 1942, upon the recommendation of the Advisory Committee of Historians of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., and carried on with support from the Rockefeller Foundation, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., and the Institute of Early American History and Culture (a joint enterprise of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., and the College of William and Mary). The project entailed, in addition to the actual indexing, the assembling of a complete collection of photostats of all 1,687 known numbers of the various newspapers published in Williamsburg under the title *Virginia Gazette* during the period 1736-80—with the addition of nearly two hundred

<sup>1</sup> Details concerning these papers and their relationships are given in the Introduction (Vol. I, p. vi) and in Clarence S. Brigham's *History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820* (Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1947), II, 1158-63.

issues to the number photostated, several years ago, by the Massachusetts Historical Society—and, as a by-product, the listing and micro-filming of the entire file, so that a positive copy of the source material is now available from the Institute for \$50.00.<sup>2</sup>

Nominally an index to a number of Colonial newspapers, the *Virginia Gazette Index*, because of the skill and the imagination with which it was made, is actually much more. The editors have done their work so well that the result answers directly many questions of fact, opens up whole new areas for study, and illuminates the customs, the thinking, the language, and the life of an entire period. Both news and advertisements have been covered with a degree of thoroughness—in both headings and cross-references—that leaves little to desire. References are by page and column, and the system of abbreviations and the method of indicating dates are clearly explained in the Introduction.

"News"—however false or delayed—is covered selectively for the world in general, in greater detail for Great Britain, and in minute detail for information concerning the Empire and the colonies, for which all personal names have been indexed. Preference is usually for subject entry with geographical subdivision: "Boston port bill, subscription for relief from in Eng."; "Gold mines, discovered in Brazil"; "Pork, exported from Md. to Bermuda"; "Strawberries, price in London, Eng."; "Surpluses, stolen from Charles parish, Va., church." Long lists of references appear under such general headings as "Ships," "Shipwrecks," and "Suicides."

Advertisements are indexed by person, institution, place, and subject, with entries, generally speaking, for all items for sale: "Almonds, candied, for sale, in Richmond, Va."; "Deserters, adv. for"; "Gold Mason brooches, for sale, in Baltimore, Md."; "Madison, James, jr. (1751-1836), adv. for missing horse"; "Milton, John, books for sale in Williamsburg, Va." (with references to eighteen advertisements, with dates ranging from 1751 to 1776); "Organists, adv. for, in St. Mary's parish, Va."

The result in every way justifies the compilers' hope of producing "a historical work of reference rather than an alphabetical list of names and places with some obvious subject headings thrown in for good measure" (Introduction, p. v). As one evidence of the value of

the book for students of American culture one can find, without great search, terms for which the Index points to dates considerably earlier than those recorded in *A Dictionary of American English*. *Castor oil*, for example, is entered in the *DAE* first for 1812, but the Index provides a reference for 1770; and *hand organ* and *pine shingles*—both marked Americanisms in the *DAE*, with "first" dates of, respectively, 1796 and 1836—are indexed for 1767 and 1770, respectively. The contribution that this index could have made to the *DAE*, had it been ready in time, is obvious.

A final word of praise is due for the excellent appearance of the lithoprinted text and the sturdiness and simplicity of the binding.

ROBERT W. WADSWORTH

University of Chicago Library

*Bibliographien zum deutschen Schrifttum der Jahre 1939-1950*. By HANS WIDMANN. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1951. Pp. xii+284.

"Schrifttum" is one of those elusive German words difficult to translate into precise English. According to Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, one meaning of the word is "the literature in a universal sense." It is in this sense that "Schrifttum" is used in the title of this publication, so that a free translation might well read "Bibliographies of German Published Contributions to Knowledge of the Years 1939-1950."

According to the author, the following types of material have been included: (1) bibliographies—both primary and secondary; (2) periodicals and abstract journals, in so far as they regularly contain systematic bibliographies; (3) reviews of research (e.g., *Fortschritte der Botanik*) containing citations to the literature, and handbooks in so far as they include references to the literature. Periodicals which do not serve a primary bibliographical mission have been included only where no systematic bibliography exists in the field. In spite of the chronological limitation imposed by the title, bibliographies in publication before 1939 have been included if still current after that date. It may not be amiss to stress the international scope of this work, as an attempt has been made to list non-German publications with bibliographies which include German literature, as, for instance, the *American Economic Review*, *Biological Abstracts*, and the *Year's Work in English Studies*.

<sup>2</sup> A special rate of \$85.00 is offered to purchasers of both the index and the microfilm.



The principal portion of the work is given over to a classified arrangement of the titles cited. Following the sections on bibliography of bibliographies and on national bibliography, the subject bibliographies are grouped under the following major headings: humanistic studies, mathematical and natural sciences, medicine, agriculture and forestry, technology, and sport. For each German serial title the latest volume issued before the collapse in 1945 is specified together with information regarding the resumption of publication. The number of the current volume is given for both German and foreign serials, and useful annotations are included for many entries. In addition to a detailed table of contents, there is an author-title index covering the approximately 1,500 titles listed.

The second major part consists of an essay describing the present German bibliographical situation in terms of the latest developments in German bibliography and the coverage given German publications by foreign bibliographies. The essay concludes with a section on the specific mission of bibliography today.

Many of the titles listed are, of course, so well known as to be commonplace; but many others are obscure and little known. It appears to this reviewer that Widmann has produced a very useful compilation by bringing together into usable form a variety of information from widely scattered sources. Although the author readily admits that imperfections must exist and that omissions must have occurred, no glaring errors or lacunae were observed by the reviewer.

CARL W. HINTZ

University of Oregon Library  
Eugene, Oregon

*Deutsche Zeitschriften 1945-1949.* Prepared on behalf of the Börsenverein deutscher Verleger- und Buchhändler-Verbände by the Deutsche Bibliothek Frankfurt am Main. Frankfurt: Buchhändler-Vereinigung G.m.b.H., 1950. Pp. xv + 173.

Joris Vorstius in his *Ergebnisse und Fortschritte der Bibliographie in Deutschland seit dem ersten Weltkrieg* (Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1948) complains about the incomplete bibliographical coverage of periodicals in Germany. He attributes this to the lack of a uniform definition of the term "periodical" and to the large number of periodicals issued at regular

intervals but without interest for the scholar or bookseller. This group, which includes annual reports, bulletins, and business reports, is commonly published for a practical purpose and is frequently distributed only among members of a trade or profession or organization and not available in the book trade. The several existing German bibliographies and trade lists of periodicals are in no way complete, *Sperling's Zeitschriften- und Zeitungs-Adressbuch* being the best among them, and Vorstius felt that a complete list of current German periodicals, organized by subject, would be highly desirable.

The Börsenverein deutscher Verleger- und Buchhändler-Verbände has now sponsored a bibliography, compiled by the Deutsche Bibliothek in Frankfurt am Main, called *Deutsche Zeitschriften 1945-1949*. This bibliography, though not attempting to fill the gap which Vorstius indicated, is an important step forward. The bibliography is selective: only the more important German periodicals, available in the book trade, are included, and only periodicals which are current or have ceased publication during the years 1945 to 1949 are listed. The last prewar or war issue is indicated for periodicals which resumed publication after May 8, 1945.

Changes in title, supplements, editors, place of publication, size, frequency of publication, and price are indicated. The volume number, sometimes the report year, and dates of irregular publications are given.

The arrangement is by twenty large subject groups, many of them subdivided further. An index by title, subject, and catchword, with cross-references from variants of the title, and a separate index of publishers with their latest addresses are added. A preface in German, English, French, and Spanish explains the use of the bibliography.

In spite of the limitation to periodicals available in the book trade, the work includes official publications, gazettes, etc., especially of the occupying powers, whenever distributed by trade channels. Annuals, e.g., the *Deutschland-Jahrbuch*, *Sperling*, and *Kürschner's deutscher Literatur-Kalender*, are also included.

The wealth of bibliographical detail distinguishes this list from the other existing reference sources. *Sperling* is more inclusive but less detailed, and the last issue (1947) is out of date now. The official German *Postzeitungsliste* does not attempt any subject classification. Most other handbooks available, as, for ex-

ample, *Der Leitfaden für Presse und Werbung* (Essen: W. Stamm, 1950), the *Lizenzen-Handbuch deutscher Verlage* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1949), or the *Zeitungs- und Zeitschriften-Katalog* (Berlin: Columba-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1949), offer information more from the viewpoint of periodicals as advertising mediums.

The present bibliography is ideal for the selecting librarian and scholar who needs information on existing leading German periodicals in a special field and for the acquisitions librarian and cataloger who wishes to determine the completeness of the run of a periodical.

JOHANNES L. DEWTON

*Library of Congress*

*Anuario español e hispanoamericano del libro y de las artes gráficas con el catálogo mundial del libro impreso en lengua española e índice general de los cuatro volúmenes publicados, 1947-1949.* Compiled by JAVIER LASO DE LA VEGA JIMÉNEZ-PLACER and FRANCISCO CERVERA JIMÉNEZ-ALFARO. Madrid: Editores del Anuario Marítimo Español, 1951. Pp. xxiv + 838.

This volume constitutes a monument to the bibliographic energy of Sr. Lasso de la Vega, Spain's outstanding librarian, and of the Register of Copyright in Madrid. It lists 13,357 publications in Spanish that appeared during 1947-49 in Spain, Hispanic America, and the United States, all classified by subject and decimal system. Full bibliographical data have been provided for items published in Spain, including prices, and as much information as was available on other works. Periodicals, government documents, and trade publications are all to be found here. Brief annotations are provided for some of the items. To whet the appetite of librarians still further, a cumulative index has been added which includes the three previous volumes for a grand total of 30,000 works published in Spanish during the years 1945-49.

Various observations set forth by the compilers in their introduction assist the reader in understanding their purpose and the state of publishing in Spain today. The volume is definitely not limited in scope to the interests of the 20,000,000 inhabitants of Spain but is aimed at the wider audience of the 133,000,000

Spanish-speaking persons throughout the world. Spanish readers, we are told, do not consume much poetry and philosophy, but almost one-third of all the items published are literature, much of it in translation, particularly from English and American authors, with Somerset Maugham the most popular. Although one-fifth of all the items listed are translations, there are, however, some signs of a slow but steady recuperation by Spanish authors and dramatists. Popular medicine of the Paul de Kruif variety seems to be on the increase, and the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas continues to sponsor many substantial works, particularly, in the field of American studies, through the Escuela de Estudios Hispanoamericanos in Seville. The volume closes with a considerable amount of miscellaneous data on literary and movie prizes and best sellers in various countries, lists of publishers and bookdealers in the Spanish-speaking world, and information on cultural institutions in Hispanic America.

LEWIS HANKE

*University of Texas  
Austin, Texas*

*Royal Commission Studies: A Selection of Essays Prepared for the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences.* Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier, 1951. Pp. 430. \$3.00.

In the Introduction to this volume the chairman of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences states that "a number of persons eminent in their arts or their professions were requested to prepare for us studies." A selection of twenty-eight, including one by a member of the Royal Commission, was made and the authors asked "to reduce them if possible to about five thousand words" for publication. Of five studies on the sciences (it should be said that the word "studies" is rather pretentious and that "essays" appears more appropriate), two are by French-Canadians and one each by members of the faculties of the University of Saskatchewan, Queens University, and the University of Toronto. Of the remainder, and of those in English, two are by members of the staff of the University of Saskatchewan, one by a member of the staff of the University of Manitoba, five

by individuals associated with the University of Toronto, and one by a member of the staff of Dalhousie University. Separate essays are presented in English and French on language, the press, literature, philosophy, psychology, the social sciences, and history. Separate essays in English are given on the Canadian Archives, historical societies and museums, music, the theater, painting, and architecture, accompanied by an essay on the arts in the Province of Quebec. The introductory essay is by a veteran journalist.

The Commission was compelled to recognize regions, language (ten authors are French-Canadians), and religion in the presentation and to state that "all the views expressed . . . are to be attributed solely to their respective authors." The volume should have been planned, and seems to have been planned, moreover, to command the important continuing support of authors toward the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission. The volume, in whole and in part, reflects the strong and weak points of Canadian cultural life. Plitudinous backslapping is accompanied by penetrating observations. With few exceptions, the essays suggest limitations as well as effective ways in which federal grants might be spent to offset them, though the dangers of such support are not overlooked. These studies provide a useful, perhaps slightly exaggerated, description of handicaps in each field of cultural development. In the main, they are informative and competent, and it would be ungracious to enumerate deficiencies. The Government Printing Office has not maintained the level of printing which might be expected from a volume on cultural development, if proofreading may be used as a test. Nor can the government be said to take a keen interest in diffusion by setting a price of \$3.00 and compelling a Canadian reviewer to pay 10 per cent duty on a volume recrossing the American border.

H. A. INNIS

University of Toronto  
Toronto, Canada

*A Selected Bibliography on City and Regional Planning.* By SAMUEL SPIELVOGEL. Washington, D.C.: Scarecrow Press (3341 Prospect Ave., N.W.), 1951. Pp. ix + 276. \$5.50.

It is a courageous person indeed who would be willing to undertake the thankless task of

selecting a planning bibliography consisting of 2,200 items. The American Society of Planning Officials is currently receiving some 600 planning publications per month, which range from minor items on cats and dogs to serious works on planning and actual planning reports on all levels of competence. Thus the yearly total is three times the number of items listed in the present bibliography. This reviewer was unable to find in it one of the most important books issued in recent years, *Planning the Neighborhood*, prepared by the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing of the American Public Health Association and published by the Public Administration Service. In the last two years the American Society of Planning Officials has published a series of bulletins for subscribers to its Planning Advisory Service. In many instances these represent the most exhaustive research on various planning subjects to be found anywhere. There were, for instance, reports on "Municipal Auditoriums and the City Plan," "Architectural Control," "Drive-in Theaters," "Trailers and Trailer Camps in the Community," "Street-Naming and House-Numbering Systems," "Self-service Gasoline Stations," "Cemeteries in the City Plan," "Population Forecasting," "Motor Truck Terminals," "Community Inducements to Industry," "Television Requirements and Regulations," and "Regulating, Storage, Distribution and Use of Propane and Butane." Because these reports—the most authoritative studies on their respective subjects—were not available to the author of the bibliography, he does not list them. He also fails to list the *Zoning Digest*, which summarizes all the decisions of all the appellate courts at the state level. The bibliography appears weak, furthermore, in its selection of bibliographies dealing with various aspects of planning.

Years and experience are constantly adding to the quality of planning literature. It may well be that the most effective bibliography would be one prepared at the end of each year and listing the outstanding reports published during that year. While the author of the present bibliography has provided a useful reference work, the price of \$5.50 seems high in view of its limitations.

WALTER H. BLUCHER

American Society of Planning Officials  
Chicago, Illinois

"Personnel Administration." ("Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library," Vol. IX.) Los Angeles: Bureau of Budget and Efficiency, September, 1950. Pp. 55. (Lithoprinted.)

Several of the earlier reports on the organization, administration, and management of the Los Angeles Public Library gave some consideration to personnel problems as they concerned general administration, business administration, the Central Library, the branch libraries, and technical services. The present volume therefore concerns itself "with over-all personnel management and its related activities together with a searching analysis of the professional staff" (p. 1).

Historically, personnel functions in the Library have been primarily the responsibility of the line supervisors with some assistance from the secretary of the Los Angeles Civil Service Commission and from the accounting office.

A departmental personnel officer was appointed on January 1, 1948, and served for twenty-two months. Twenty specific duties of the personnel officer were enumerated by the city librarian, typical of those of any departmental staff personnel office in a jurisdiction under civil service. When the position of departmental personnel officer was abolished in November, 1949, the personnel office was placed under the direction of the assistant city librarian (Extension). Apparently, most of the data for the present volume were gathered during the period when the personnel officer reported directly to the city librarian.

For the years from 1925-26 through 1947-48, the equated full-time staff of the Library was highest in 1931-32 (637). By 1947-48, it had been built up again, following the depression period, to 606. In each of these two years, 37 per cent of the total staff was professional. Comparison of total staff in relation to population served shows Los Angeles "not markedly different" from other large cities.

Data furnished for the professional staff need not be discussed in detail here. To non-Los Angeles members of the profession who have admired the subject specialization of the Central Library it comes as a shock to read that "only five of fifty-nine subject librarians have graduate training in addition to an undergraduate major in the field of their present responsibility, and only two have gone as high as a master's degree in a relevant field" (p. 22).

Probably of most general interest to the pro-

fession is the proposed plan of classification of professional positions. Below the position of assistant city librarian three services are proposed: subject, technical, and community service. Within each service five levels are proposed: beginning professional, intermediate, senior, principal, and division librarian. Administrative duties begin at the third level, and subject specialization continues through the fourth level, thus providing promotional opportunities for the librarian who wishes to develop a career in a subject field. At the fifth level the proposed positions are primarily administrative, such as head of a subject division or of a regional library.

The failure of the Library to distinguish with sufficient sharpness the assignment of professional and clerical duties is discussed in the report. Since most of the staff of the Library, quite properly, is clerical, it seems unfortunate that the survey staff did not also propose a series of classes of clerical positions which would take account of these important duties and would provide a career service for clerical staff. In a final recommendation it is proposed that the Board of Civil Service Commissioners make such a study.

Of the eleven recommendations, the first suggests that the personnel office be re-established "as a staff agency under the direct supervision of the City Librarian," while the remainder cover types of activities that might normally be expected of a personnel agency.

To this reviewer the chief value of this volume is the light that it sheds on the past history and problems of the Los Angeles Public Library and its personnel.

EDWARD A. WIGHT

*Newark Public Library*  
Newark, New Jersey

"Library Relationships in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area." ("Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library," Vol. X.) Los Angeles: Bureau of Budget and Efficiency, 1950. Pp. 55. (Lithoprinted.)

"General Administration." ("Organization, Administration, and Management of the Los Angeles Public Library," Vol. XI.) Los Angeles: Bureau of Budget and Efficiency, 1951. Pp. 77. (Lithoprinted.)

"Recapitulation of Recommendations." ("Organization, Administration, and Manage-

ment of the Los Angeles Public Library," Vol. XII.) Los Angeles: Bureau of Budget and Efficiency, 1951. Pp. 55. (Lithoprinted.)

Volume X of the Los Angeles Public Library survey is in some respects the most important in the entire series. It deals with fundamental questions involved in providing complete library service on a regional basis. Because the problem is of such general concern and because the Los Angeles area seems to offer every possible obstacle to regional service, the data and recommendations are of much more than local interest.

Recognizing the fact that only a major reorganization of local government in southern California would permit a completely satisfactory solution to the problem, the surveyors realistically recommend an attempt to secure what they call an "intermediate" solution. This involves several changes, including the development of a high degree of co-operation among all library agencies, public and private, on such matters as acquisition and processing of materials. The methods suggested are by no means new. All have been discussed at length by librarians for many years; many have been successfully employed in other parts of the country; all are entirely feasible. It is only surprising that so little has actually been done in the Los Angeles region and that the survey must recommend not the expansion of a program but its creation.

Another type of co-operation recommended by the survey is reciprocal service, which has already been rather highly developed by the public librarians working through their informal but very effective organization, the Public Library Executives Association of Southern California. Since 1944 twenty-one contracts have been negotiated among eight public library systems, by which services are exchanged without charge. Because of the crazy-quilt geographical pattern of local government in southern California, such a program is logical and desirable. The survey recommends that these contracts be renegotiated, with free exchange of service only when the number of registrants from any two jurisdictions is nearly equal. Many assumptions, some of which are admitted but none of which is explained, are involved in the data upon which this recommendation is based.

The surveyors believe that further development of reciprocal service and similar contractual arrangements on other matters will be the beginning of a plan which would ultimately

eliminate, through consolidation, many smaller library agencies in the area. At the moment, however, reciprocal service will probably be curtailed rather than extended because of the question of costs.

Volume XI of the survey is a splendid analysis of the organization of the Los Angeles Public Library. The recommendations for changes follow the generally accepted principles of administration. The immediate effects of the survey upon the Los Angeles Public Library are probably most apparent in its administrative reorganization, much of which has already taken place along the lines suggested by this volume. Another subject treated at length in this particular section of the survey is the necessity for planning. The staff of the Library is rather severely criticized for the inadequacy of its planning in the past. The tone of this section of the report is out of keeping with the admirably dispassionate objectivity that characterizes the rest of it. Furthermore, during the period in question, funds were not available for the top administrative personnel and the research assistants who are essential, as this survey demonstrates, to any satisfactory program of planning in an institution as large as the Los Angeles Public Library.

One of the most interesting sections of this volume deals with the function and nature of the library board. The survey recommends the creation of a new type of board, to be known as a "Library Policy Commission." This commission should be representative of the citizens and responsible directly to them for determination of general policies relating to the Library. Such a commission might be larger than the present board of five. It would be denied any administrative functions. The arguments presented in favor of these recommendations are convincing, and most public librarians would probably consider them eminently sensible.

To discover how the surveyors would establish such a board, one must turn to the Appendix to Volume XII, where the actual wording of proposed charter amendments is given. No reference to this appendix appears in Volume XI. The proposed charter amendments would create a policy commission of five members appointed by the mayor with the approval of the council. Its organization, therefore, would be exactly the same as that of the present board. Its administrative duties, however, are definitely eliminated, and its functions are defined as the development of policy and the making of



rules and regulations for the operation of the Library. It is difficult to see how five individuals could be truly representative of so complex and large a community as Los Angeles. It is also difficult to see how they could be responsible directly to the citizens unless elected directly by them. At this point the recommendations of the surveyors and the conclusions drawn from their data do not coincide.

Volume XII of the survey is a recapitulation of the recommendations, rearranged in three sections: for consideration by the city council; for consideration by the board of library commissioners; for consideration by the city librarian and staff. The only new material is the Appendix, "Proposed Charter Amendments." Some infrequent references are made to the original volumes from which the recommendations are quoted but not to the pages. Because the report of the Los Angeles Public Library survey is obviously a document to which frequent reference should and will be made, a detailed index would have been much more useful than this recapitulation.

The Los Angeles Public Library survey is, without question, one of the important documents in the public library field. It is a thorough, detailed analysis of one of our most important and largest public library systems. Many basic questions on the nature and function of public libraries are raised and discussed. In many ways it is a kind of supplement to the Public Library Inquiry. There can be no question of its value to the staff of the Los Angeles Public Library, whether all the recommendations are adopted or not. It will also continue to be of importance to public librarians elsewhere and to students.

The selection and organization of the data are excellent. The pattern of the first eleven volumes, each on a rather narrowly limited subject, results in a monotonous and repetitious style. The document, however, is meant to be consulted rather than read, and its arrangement does facilitate reference. Additional editorial work and an index would have improved it. The data, however, are well chosen and presented and will undoubtedly continue to appear for many years in future studies of public libraries.

LEWIS F. STIEG

*University of Southern California Library  
Los Angeles, California*

*Branch Library Practice.* By A. G. S. ENSER.  
London: Grafton & Co., 1950. Pp. 128. 21s.

In the Introduction by Leslie M. Rees to Mr. Enser's little volume, a key to the nature of the book is provided. Stating the book's aim to be to instil "a new inspiration for advancement" in branch librarianship, he goes on to say: "The first step towards the achievement of this object is the setting out in a clear manner the purposes of branch libraries and the duties and obligations of those associated with them in a clear and precise manner." The tortured syntax is a presage of the literary style which is to come, and the promised setting-out of duties is duly delivered. In twenty-three chapters averaging from four to five pages each, Mr. Enser takes up a variety of such topics of professional interest as public relations ("Courtesy costs nothing is an old saying, and how true"), professional conduct ("Ensure that the first words spoken upon answering a call are: 'XYZ Branch Library, can we help you,' not 'Hello'"), departmentalism ("The deputy chief librarian . . . must respect his chief, and show this respect openly in public so that the whole tone of the staff approach to the chief is similarly evident"), library furniture ("It is amazing how different a branch library will look with a vase of flowers on a table"), facilities for staff ("Comfortable accommodations should be provided in a staff room offering reasonable facilities for rest, cooking and ablutions, not forgetting that it is obligatory to provide separate toilets where mixed staff are employed"), and dress ("Suede shoes, corduroys of any colour, fancy waistcoats, polo-neck pullovers, or loud jackets on male assistants may be suitable for their other pursuits but certainly not as public librarians").

The book abounds in quotable material of similar caliber, but these few examples should serve to give a taste of its quality: its firm grasp of the obvious, its complete mastery of the cliché, its undeviating devotion to the pedestrian and the mundane, and its superb indifference to the common rules of grammar and sentence structure. If it were not so badly written, the book might serve as a staff manual for the use of untrained assistants. But, concerned as it is with the "cheery countenance" and the "tidy" desk, it hardly qualifies as professional literature. The discussion of such low-level problems can contribute little to that "general

highering of library service" which is Mr. Enser's avowed aim.

LESTER ASHEIM

Graduate Library School  
University of Chicago

*Keeping Reading Programs Abreast of the Times: Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Reading Held at the University of Chicago, 1950*, Vol. XII. Compiled and edited by WILLIAM S. GRAY. ("Supplementary Educational Monographs Published in Conjunction with the *School Review* and the *Elementary School Journal*," No. 72.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, October, 1950. Pp. 247. \$2.90.

The *Proceedings* of the 1950 Conference on Reading rounds out an even dozen volumes that have encompassed practically all phases of the reading process. This twelfth volume is probably the most comprehensive of all, for it deals with reading within the context of society itself and analyzes in some detail the impact of the one upon the other. It presents a broad concept of educational objectives, with consideration of psychological, cultural, and community factors as well as different types of communication mediums. Only when reading is developed and integrated with these various forces in a systematic and purposeful way, can education achieve its goals and reading assume its full measure of effectiveness.

The presentation of material follows, in general, the pattern that has been set for the University of Chicago annual reading conferences. Broad aspects of the theme are presented by authorities in the field of reading and education, following which they are considered in a more practical setting for various learning levels—Grades I-III; IV-VI; VII-X; and XI-XIV.

The initial papers attack the larger phases of the theme. Dora V. Smith capably considers the expanding demands imposed on the reader today. W. S. Gray traces our increased understanding of the reading process through research and frontier thinking, urging continued evaluation of existing programs to keep them abreast of the current scene. The recent changes in the purposes of the whole school program are reviewed by Herold C. Hunt, while Earl Wiltse stresses the school's responsibility in keeping reading programs timely.

Following these keynote chapters, reading is

considered in relation to all agencies of mass communication and aids to learning. A significant chapter, that should be carefully read by librarians as well as teachers, is the one entitled "Influence of Community Factors on Learning." Only when these factors are considered along with those of the school and classroom environment and with the elements of personality development, can there be real achievement of an effectual reading program for everyone.

"Classroom Techniques in Improving Reading" receives only incidental attention, since the topic was reported in detail in the eleventh volume of this series. However, the material, though limited, is helpful, especially in the grade-level chapters. The individual reader, particularly the one with problems, receives attention in chapters on "Personal Characteristics That Retard Reading Progress," "Services of Remedial Centers in Improving Reading," and "The Role of Group Dynamics and Differentiated Instruction in Promoting Pupil Development." Only that most often neglected creature, the precocious, exceptional reader, continues to be ignored. I searched diligently for material to guide me in my dealings with him, but he is left to fend for himself.

We hear much today about the return to the "three R's" of education and to old-time teaching of fundamentals. Local school systems have frequently been attacked because children cannot read. Parents blame teachers, and teachers blame parents. Some of this criticism is healthy, and some is pernicious, especially where argument is colored by emotion. A partial correction for this unrest may be found in the constructive suggestions included in the sections on "Organizing and Directing Reading Improvement Programs" and "Supervising Techniques in Improving Reading." The chapter on "Enlisting the Co-operation and Support of the Public" should be especially studied and shared with parents.

As previously stated, this is a very comprehensive book. Its very comprehensiveness may be discouraging, especially to the teacher aware of his inadequacies in the face of criticism and apparent failure. He need not be discouraged if he reads the book properly. The major chapters should be read by all—educators, teachers, librarians, and the lay public—but slowly and thoughtfully rather than in one superficial skimming, for they are designed for growth in background and increased vision and understanding.

The grade-level chapters, on the other hand, should serve as little manuals of guidance, and the teacher will often refer to them for practical suggestions. This book is directed particularly to teachers, but librarians may well be proud of the emphasis placed on their wares and services. They will find here many responsibilities and directives that should not be ignored.

I believe the theme of the whole book is admirably stated in the concluding paragraph of Grace Strickland's paper:

Difficult days lie ahead for teachers. We need to improve our ability to work with parents and to interpret our program to the public. Many parents do not understand the changes that are taking place in education or the far-reaching significance of our broader goals for children. Teachers need to keep abreast of educational research and thinking and to be ready to explain and defend the social leadership they exert through their guidance and development of children. Desirable personal and social effects for both children and teachers will be the inevitable result of wise and wide reading which develops wholesome and mature minds [p. 182].

ALICE BROOKS MCGUIRE

Casis Elementary School  
Austin, Texas

*Les Débuts de la presse française: Nouveaux aperçus.* By FOLKE DAHL, FANNY PETIBON, and MARGUERITE BOULET. ("Acta Bibliothecae Gotoburgensis," Vol. IV.) Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber Bokhandel, 1951. Pp. viii + 75. Sw. Kr. 7:50.

In 1846 there appeared the first edition of Hatin's *Histoire du journal en France*. In this work Hatin made the first of many claims that to Théophraste Renaudot belongs, among other things, the honor of having published the first periodical in France and in the French language. The re-examination stated in the title of the present work is based on evidence that Renaudot was not the first in either field.

Hatin developed an excellent definition of the periodical that has been generally used by subsequent students. Briefly stated, there are three main criteria: the work must consistently contain a rather wide coverage of material; the issues must appear with a certain regularity; and the title must be relatively fixed. This is the definition used by Dahl, Petibon, and Boulet.

In the first section Mr. Dahl cites the fact that Caspar van Hilten published a *Courant d'Italie et d'Allemagne* in Amsterdam. Only five

issues in the years 1620 and 1621 have been found, and there is no way to fix the date of the initial issue or the final number. Contemporary documents are useful but not conclusive. It seems highly probable, therefore, that a periodical in the French language first appeared outside France. But, as the author himself admits, the evidence of five surviving numbers, while indicative, cannot be said to be final.

It is against Renaudot as the founder of the periodical press in France that the three collaborators make a most effective case. Some ten years ago Mr. Dahl discovered that the file of Renaudot's *Gazette* at the Royal Library in Stockholm contained a single issue entitled *Nouvelles ordinaires de divers endroits*, correctly dated October 31, 1631, but bearing the number 42—a number which did not fit the rest of the file. Furthermore, it did not bear the imprint of Renaudot. He suspected that this might be an entirely different publication, but a single issue was hardly sufficient to work with. In the hope that other issues might have survived in France, he passed on his information to Miss Petibon, a member of the staff of the Bibliothèque Nationale, with the suggestion that she examine other files of the *Gazette*.

At the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal she found twenty-three different numbers of the *Nouvelles ordinaires* bearing the imprint of Jean Martin and Louys Vendosme, both together and individually. Unfortunately, none of these antedates May 30, 1631 (the first issue of the *Gazette*), but enough have survived to suggest that the first issue probably appeared in January, 1631.

This probability is made much more certain by the work of Miss Boulet. Renaudot was involved in a number of lawsuits, and Miss Boulet, who has specialized in French legal history, examines the pertinent surviving records in some detail. She gives, in fact, an excellent commentary on their relation to contemporary practice. An appendix contains the two most important documents in full.

Each of these authors, in turn, adds evidence to support the thesis that Renaudot was not the first to publish a periodical in France and not the first to publish a periodical in the French language. All three wisely refuse to speculate on who might have been the first in either field.

EUGENE B. BARNES

University of Oregon Library  
Eugene, Oregon

## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of the "Library Quarterly":

In the first paragraph of her review of *Literary Property in the United States*, Miss Nicholson says: "The carefree belief of the average writer and, unfortunately, publisher that the act is so complicated and unwieldy that it can be interpreted only by a lawyer seems to me a source of many of our troubles." Yet, in 1945, Miss Nicholson herself issued a 245-page book to explain the act.<sup>1</sup>

In her second paragraph Miss Nicholson attempts to show, by quoting out of context, that my book is limited to an examination of the weaknesses of the copyright law. The sentence which she purports to quote reads: "This book attempts to determine from the primary sources—the American court records—just what literary property is: what it is intended to protect; why; how; and for whom; the extent to which these goals have been achieved; and what, if anything, may be done about it." Miss Nicholson must surely know that there is a difference between *literary property* and the *United States Copyright Act*, and, if she does not, she ought to be able to learn it from this book. Miss Nicholson bases her strictures solely on the last phrase of this sentence and an antecedent for "it" which she supplies but which is not in the text. My book does, in fact, as stated in the sentence from which Miss Nicholson quotes, deal with the broad concept of literary property, and a major portion of the book deals with the philosophy underlying common-law literary property as well as with that underlying the statute.

In her next paragraph—disregarding all the court decisions given in my book—Miss Nicholson calls the *fact* that the copyright of an issue of a journal does not necessarily protect the individual articles in the issue "Mr. Shaw's opinion," and goes on to say that she does not share that fear. In view of the cases cited, this is hardly a matter of opinion. The Supreme Court (see *Mifflin v. Dutton* on p. 207) said: "As we have already held that the copyright of the *Atlantic Monthly* by Ticknor and Fields did not operate as a notice of the author to any article therein appearing, it follows from the case just decided [*Mifflin v. White*] that the appearance of the last thirteen chapters in the *Atlantic Monthly* vitiated the copyright." About a dozen

other cases cited point out that the copyright of an issue of a journal does not necessarily cover all its component parts (see pp. 51-53), but Miss Nicholson cites no cases to support her position and refutes no cases; she simply disregards what the courts have said, labels the court decisions as my "opinion," and disagrees.

Then, at the top of the second column, Miss Nicholson takes up the statements which I cite as evidence of confusion in this whole field. She does not deny the statements (as noted above, she is just as apt as any of the persons cited to supply her own opinion in lieu of evidence) but argues that we should not blame the law if copyright lawyers make incorrect statements. Now, the question is, who was blaming the law? These examples were given to show that confusion exists, and they do show that confusion exists. Miss Nicholson's own book spends some thirty pages listing questions and answers in an attempt to clear up that confusion.

Next, Miss Nicholson tilts at my recommendations of "fair use." Here, at least, she is closer to the legitimate purview of the reviewer. But by making up a one-in-one-thousand "case" and omitting the other half of my measure for unfair use, i.e., damage of more than \$10.00, she arrives at the conclusion that "leaving to the discretion of the ethical writer the interpretation of 'reasonable' and 'fair' would seem much safer than any arbitrary percentage." From this statement you might infer that Miss Nicholson believes (a) that we should leave the question of fair use to the author's discretion and (b) that there should be no hard-and-fast rules. Yet in her own book Miss Nicholson says: "Scholars of the first rank have been found to infringe the work of their colleagues. . . . The cautious publisher will check his authors' works no matter how high their standing in the academic or professional world" (p. 98). And on page 146 of her book Miss Nicholson says: "How much can be quoted without the specific permission of the copyright owner? Probably no other question besets publishers—and the Copyright Office—so frequently. In a form letter the Copyright Office says cautiously but not very helpfully, 'One must use his own best judgment'—which is exactly what the quoting author and the publisher want to avoid." She then goes on to set an objective standard of her own, saying: "No quotation of over 500 words . . . should ever be used without permission. . . . Not more than three or

<sup>1</sup> M. Nicholson, *A Manual of Copyright Practice* . . . (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945).

four lines of poetry should be used without permission. . . ."

So, apparently, despite her position in this review, Miss Nicholson does not trust the author to decide and does not disapprove of objective standards for fair use. Even if Miss Nicholson were willing to leave the matter of determining fair use up to the judgment of each scholar, that would not appear to have any standing in law.

At the bottom of the second column, Miss Nicholson reiterates her allegations about the copyright of journal articles—but she neither refutes the cases I cite nor supplies any citations to support her position. She refers to "a history of tradition and usage." That is given in the cases which I cite. But in regard to this business of reassignment she says on page 170 of her own book: "In 99 cases out of 100 . . . it is undetected. The hundredth time the copyright is lost." Stated more concisely, this means that in 99 cases out of 100 a faulty claim does not get caught but that, when it is caught or challenged, a faulty assignment or notice is fatal to the copyright. This is precisely the point I was making and to which Miss Nicholson objects in her review.

At the top of page 223 Miss Nicholson agrees that the public issuance of reprints without notice invalidates the copyright. But, gratuitously, she goes on to argue that the author ought to assume responsibility for writing the notice on each reprint by hand. That has nothing to do with the book being reviewed. Though it would be difficult to determine this from the review, the point made in my book is that the reprint rarely carries a notice of copyright and that failure to include the notice on the reprint puts the material so reprinted into the public domain. This means that the great mass of periodical articles which have been reprinted are in the public domain. Behind this smoke screen of irrelevant argument Miss Nicholson appears to concede that fact.

But, having argued in this paragraph that the author ought to assume responsibility for writing the copyright notice by hand in each reprint, Miss Nicholson argues in the next paragraph that copyright should not be limited to authors because they cannot be trusted to protect their rights. This is a preposterous *non sequitur*. Limiting copyright to authors will not change our pattern of publishing one iota. Obtaining copyright in the name of the author is a common present-day practice. And if Miss Nicholson was too busy to read the book that she was tearing down, she might at least have been expected to consult page 58 of her own book, where she herself gives four good arguments in favor of copyrighting in the name of the author!

Toward the bottom of the column, Miss Nicholson raises the bogey of moral rights—but by this time we should not have expected her to have read the cases I cited on pages 20-22, which show clearly that the Doctrine of Moral Right has been considered and rejected by our courts.

There are many fundamental problems in the field of literary property. Despite Miss Nicholson's disregard of the treatment of common-law property in unpublished manuscripts, they represent some of the more troublesome and pressing problems. Whatever Miss Nicholson's review may be worth, it reinforces my conviction that we must take this important subject out of the field of desk-pounding and double talk and develop a firmly grounded philosophy and practice in the whole field of literary property.

RALPH R. SHAW

U.S. Department of Agriculture Library  
Washington, D.C.

[A copy of Mr. Shaw's letter was sent to Miss Nicholson. She wishes to state in reply only that she stands upon the judgments expressed in her review.  
—EDITOR.]



## ANN ARBOR PUBLISHERS

**URBAN SOCIOLOGY AND THE EMERGING ATOMIC MEGALOPOLIS.** By JESSE WALTER DEES, JR. • 1950 • \$4.00.

"An introductory text and case book in the fields of urban society and social pathology.

The author has emphasized some of the problems not usually included in standard texts of urban sociology, such as the following: the emerging fringe development, the sociology of water and sewage, the concept of the emerging megalopolis, scientific measurement of cities, the three theories of urban ecological expansion, scientific standards of measurement of slums and segregation, a detailed plan for neighborhood planning, and an intensive analysis of a metropolitan region." *The American City*

Recommended by Civil Defense officials as the only text including plans for atomic decentralization.

**FLORIDA STATE INSTITUTIONS.** Edited by JESSE WALTER DEES, JR. • December 1950 • \$4.00.

**JIM CROW.** By JESSE WALTER DEES, JR., and JAMES S. HADLEY • 1951 • \$4.00.

Being adopted as a basic text by both racial groups.

*Examination copies on request*

**ANN ARBOR PUBLISHERS**  
711 North University      Ann Arbor, Mich.

*Now Available . . .*

## INDEX TO PLAYS IN COLLECTIONS

Second edition, revised and enlarged

BY JOHN H. OTTEMILLER

385 pp.

\$6.50

*and*

## DICTIONNAIRE DE BIBLIOGRAPHIE HAITIENNE

PAR MAX BISSAINTHE

1060 pp.

\$20.00

**THE SCARECROW PRESS**

3341 PROSPECT AVE. N.W. • WASHINGTON 7, D.C.

*Announcing . . .*

## LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Now available to subscribers in

— MICROFILM —

Complete volumes of *Library Quarterly* may be obtained in a single roll of positive microfilm on adequately labeled metal reels at a cost of approximately one-fourth of a cent per page, which is about equal to that of preserving them in conventional library binding. Sales will be restricted to those subscribing to the paper edition, and the film copy will be distributed only at the completion of the volume year, which ends with the October issue.

*Orders and inquiries should be directed to*

**UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS**

313 NORTH FIRST STREET

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

*The University of Chicago*

**STUDIES IN LIBRARY SCIENCE**

**FOUNDATIONS OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY**

By JESSE H. SHERA ..... \$5.00

**THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY**

By LOUIS R. WILSON and MAURICE F. TAUBER ..... \$6.00

**THE CHICAGO PUBLIC LIBRARY**

Origins and Backgrounds. By GWLADYS SPENCER ..... \$4.50

**THE SOUTHERN NEGRO AND THE PUBLIC LIBRARY**

By ELIZA ATKINS GLEASON ..... \$2.50

**WHAT READING DOES TO PEOPLE**

By DOUGLAS WAPLES, BERNARD BERELSON, and FRANKLYN R. BRADSHAW ..... \$3.00

**LIBRARIES AND READERS IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK**

By DOUGLAS WAPLES and LEON CARNOVSKY ..... \$2.00

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CATALOGING RULES BASED ON THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CODE OF 1908**

By J. C. M. HANSON ..... \$2.00

**WHO USES THE PUBLIC LIBRARY**

By W. C. HAYGOOD ..... \$2.00

**NATIONAL LIBRARIES AND FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIP**

By DOUGLAS WAPLES and HAROLD D. LASSWELL ..... \$1.50

**THE GOVERNMENT OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC LIBRARY**

By CARLETON B. JOECKEL ..... \$4.50

*Papers of the Annual Library Institute*

**1945. PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION IN LIBRARIES**

Edited by LOWELL MARTIN ..... \$3.00

**1943. THE LIBRARY IN THE COMMUNITY**

Edited by LEON CARNOVSKY and LOWELL MARTIN ..... \$3.50

**1942. THE REFERENCE FUNCTION OF THE LIBRARY**

Edited by PIERCE BUTLER ..... \$4.50

**1940. THE ACQUISITION AND CATALOGING OF BOOKS**

Edited by WILLIAM M. RANDALL ..... \$6.00

**1939. THE PRACTICE OF BOOK SELECTION**

Edited by LOUIS R. WILSON ..... \$4.50

*Joint Publication of The American Library Association  
and The University of Chicago Press*

**THE GEOGRAPHY OF READING**

By LOUIS R. WILSON ..... \$6.00

---

**THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS**